<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume and number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 6</td>
<td>9-7-55</td>
<td>No title. On Cochran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 7</td>
<td>9-21-55</td>
<td>Tensions within Soviet Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 8</td>
<td>10-5-55</td>
<td>&quot;Underground Ways&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 9</td>
<td>10-26-55</td>
<td>Tensions in the Russian Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 10</td>
<td>11-11-55</td>
<td>Attitudes to Automation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 11</td>
<td>12-9-55</td>
<td>Eugene Victor Debs; American Socialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 12</td>
<td>12-23-55</td>
<td>The Great Divide Between Thinking and Doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 13</td>
<td>1-6-56</td>
<td>Towards a New Unity of Theory and Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 14</td>
<td>1-31-56</td>
<td>A Little Bit Mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 15</td>
<td>2-29-56</td>
<td>&quot;The Fear of Self-Conceit&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 16</td>
<td>3-30-56</td>
<td>Without a Past and Without a Future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3/30/56 Lead: Where is Russia Going? (on China)

| II, 17            | 5-15-56 | Three Satellites'                                                    |
| II, 1             | 9-18-56 | A second Look at Khrushchov                                          |
| II, 2             | 10-2-56 | Negro Struggle and Labor Bureaucracy                                |
| II, 3             | 10-16-56| Life Magazine Rewrites American History                             |
| II, 4             | 10-30-56| The Absence of a Mass Labor Party in the U.S.                        |
| II, 5             | 11-13-56| Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Hungary                         |
| II, 6             | 11-27-56| Death, Freedom and the Disintegration of Communism                  |
| II, 7             | 12-11-56| Italian Communist Party Faces Revolt Dec, 8                          |
| II, 8             | 12-23-56| Automation and Brain-Washing                                         |
II, 9 1-8-57 Hungary and Kenya: Two Fights for Freedom
II, 10 1-22-57 Youth and Workers in Present Revolts
II, 11 2-5-57 The Confidence Man in Literature and Life
II, 12 2-19-57 The Terrible Split in the Scientist's Personality
II, 13 3-5-57 Exclusion of Negroes Harms Mind of Whites
II, 14 3-19-57 New Passions and New Forces
II, 15 4-2-57 On Both Sides of the Iron Curtain
II, 16 4-16-57 New Crisis in Russia
II, 17 4-30-57 The Shorter Workweek, Productivity and Profits
II, 18 5-14-57 "We Need a Clean Sweep"
II, 19 6-18-57 Scientists, Civil Rights, War and Peace
II, 20 7-6-57 "Only Freedom Can Solve the Crisis"
II, 21 8-57 "Let 100 Flowers Bloom, Let One Party Rule"
II, 22 9-57 A Challenge and a Promise
II, 23 10-57 Djileo's New Class

10/57 Editorial: Outer Space or Total War
II, 24 11-57 Russia's Internal Crisis
II, 25 12-57 An American in Paris
III, 1 1-58 (Bankruptcy of Russian Thoughts and the Sputnik)
III, 2 3-58 Unemployment and Organizations to Fight It
III, 3 4-58 One-half Year from Total Destruction
III, 4 7-58 Whither Paris?
III, 5 7/58 Lead: France at Crossroads
III, 6 8-58 Responsibility of Intellectuals
III, 7 9-58 Colonial Revolts and the Creativity of People
III, 8 9/58 Lead: On War
IV, 1 10-58 "The Confederacy, The Confederacy"
IV, 2 11-58 American Socialism and Eugene V. Debs
IV, 2 1-59 The African Revolution I
IV, 2 2-59 Role of the Negro in the Populist Movement
IV, 3  3-59  Conditions of Labor in Russia
IV, 4  4-59  Khrushchev Talks On and On
IV, 5  5-59  May 1, and the Shortest Work Day
IV, 7  8,9-59  Nuclear "Personal" Diplomacy
IV, 8  10-59  Eisenhower-Khrushchev Spectacular
IV, 9  11-59  Exclusion of Negroes Narps Minds of Whites
V, 1  1-60  Stagnation of US Economy
V, 2  2-60  Roots of Anti-Semitism
2/60  Lead: War (Khrushchev, Eisenhower, DeGaulle)
2/60  Edit: Tragedy of France
V, 3  3-60  Automation and the Dialectic
V, 4  4-60  Revolution and Counter Revolution in South Africa
V, 5  5-60  African Socialism
5/60  Editorial: Summit to War?
5/60  Freedom Fighters of South USA
V, 6  6,7-60  Sacco-Vanzetti Speak to Millions
V, 7  8,9-60  Automation Special
V, 8  10-60  War and Automation
V, 9  11-60  Russia's Changing Role in Africa
V, 10  12-60  The Cuban Revolution One Year After
VI, 1  1-61  The New Russian Communist Manifesto
1/61  Lead: Belgian Workers Show Way
VI, 2  2-61  Negro Intellectuals in Dizma
VI, 3  3-61  The Three Faces of N. Khrushchev
VI, 6  5,7-61  Intellectuals in the Age of State Capitalism
VI, 7  8,9-61  Intellectuals in the Age of State Capitalism (cont.)
VI, 8  10-61  Tito's Turnabout
VI, 9  11-61  If This Isn't Madness What Is It?
VI, 10  12-61  Marxist Humanism in New Books and Reviews
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII, 2</td>
<td>2/62</td>
<td>2-62</td>
<td>In Memoriam: Natalia Sedova, Trotsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII, 3</td>
<td>3-62</td>
<td>3-62</td>
<td>Natalia Sedova Trotsky's Break with the SWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII, 4</td>
<td>4-62</td>
<td>4-62</td>
<td>Kennedy's Nuclear Spectacle: Testing, Blackmailing, Brainwashing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII, 5</td>
<td>5-62</td>
<td>5-62</td>
<td>The Algerian Revolution Enters a New State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII, 6</td>
<td>6-7-62</td>
<td>6-7-62</td>
<td>The Evolution of a Social Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII, 7</td>
<td>6-9-62</td>
<td>6-9-62</td>
<td>Grand Illusion of Our Times: Disarmament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII, 8</td>
<td>8-9-62</td>
<td>8-9-62</td>
<td>Our Underdeveloped Intellectuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII, 9</td>
<td>10-62</td>
<td>10-62</td>
<td>Editorial: On Freedom Now (Meredith)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII, 10</td>
<td>11-62</td>
<td>11-62</td>
<td>The Automation Battlefield and the Philosophical Betcles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII, 10</td>
<td>11-62</td>
<td>11-62</td>
<td>Ideology and Revolutions: A Study in What Happens After...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII, 3</td>
<td>3-63</td>
<td>3-63</td>
<td>Freedom Occupies Consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII, 4</td>
<td>4-63</td>
<td>4-63</td>
<td>DeStalinization -- 10 Years after East German and Verhovna Revolts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII, 5</td>
<td>5-63</td>
<td>5-63</td>
<td>Author's Introduction to new Italian edition of Marxism and Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII, 6</td>
<td>6-7-63</td>
<td>6-7-63</td>
<td>Special Editorial on the Freedom Now Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII, 7</td>
<td>8-9-63</td>
<td>8-9-63</td>
<td>Lead: On Sino-Soviet Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII, 8</td>
<td>8-9-63</td>
<td>8-9-63</td>
<td>Sartre's Search for a Method to Undermine Marxism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII, 9</td>
<td>10-63</td>
<td>10-63</td>
<td>The Standstill of Nehru's India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII, 10</td>
<td>12-63</td>
<td>12-63</td>
<td>Special Editorial on the Tragic Assassination of President Kennedy, and the Urgency for Freedom Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX, 1</td>
<td>1-64</td>
<td>1-64</td>
<td>Western Intellectuals Help K. I. M. Reubkin: Lenin's Philosophic Legacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX, 2</td>
<td>2-64</td>
<td>2-64</td>
<td>New Introduction to Paperback Edition of Marxism and Freedom (Part 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX, 3</td>
<td>3-64</td>
<td>3-64</td>
<td>Negro in the Populist Movement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/64</td>
<td>Lead: On U.S. Support of Brazilian military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-64</td>
<td>Malcolm X and the 'Old Radicals'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-64</td>
<td>Guerrilla Tactics in Ideological Struggles: Study of Mao's Thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7-64</td>
<td>Sino-Indian War Reveals Relationship of Ideology to State-Capitalist; Imperialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9-64</td>
<td>Introduction to New Japanese Edition of MAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-64</td>
<td>Mao's Bomb and Khrushchev's Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/64</td>
<td>China's Entry into Nuclear Age (by Peter Mallory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-64</td>
<td>Conglomerate Mergers -- or Big Business Gets Bigger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-64</td>
<td>Special Editorial Article J. Edgar Hoover and Civil Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-65</td>
<td>Special Editorial Article: The Free Speech Movement and the 'Community of Scholars'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-65</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; (Part 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/65</td>
<td>Editorial: On Bombing of North Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/65</td>
<td>Special Letter on Selma March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-65</td>
<td>Theory of Alienation: Marx's Debt to Hegel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-65</td>
<td>Nao Side With Nasser on Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7-65</td>
<td>Special Editorial Article: The Inhumanity of the U.S. Occupation of Dominican Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9-65</td>
<td>Ramifications of the Watts Revolt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9-65</td>
<td>Editorial: On China and the India-Pakistan War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9-65</td>
<td>Lead: On the Revolt in Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-65</td>
<td>Indonesian Communism: A Case of World Communism's Decapitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-65</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; (Part 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-65</td>
<td>Why Philosophy? Why Now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-66</td>
<td>The Humanism of Marx Is the Basic Foundation for Anti-Stalinism Today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/66</td>
<td>Our Life and Times: French Elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/66</td>
<td>Editorial: On Johnson-Ky Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-65</td>
<td>Enigmatic-Humanist Analysis of Viet Nam Predicted War Moves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-66</td>
<td>Special Editorial Article: Are the US and China Headed Toward War?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7-66</td>
<td>Alienation and Revolution: A Hong Kong Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9-66</td>
<td>Editorial: American Civilization on Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9-66</td>
<td>One Again -- Theory and Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-66</td>
<td>China's Self-Created Turmoil (lead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/66</td>
<td>Editorial: Shame of a Nation-- White Racism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XII, 8 11-66 China Has Missile -- and Red Guard (TW)
Manila Conclave Exposes Imperialist Shift from Europe
To Asia (Editorial)...

XII, 1 1-67 "Black Power," Race and Class (TW)
Resurgence of Nationalism (Editorial)

XII, 2 2-67 Is China Preparing for "A Great Leap Forward" or for
World War III? (Editorial Article)
Youth, Philosophy and Revolution (A Review of the
Revolutionary Internationals) (TW)

XII, 3 3-67 Youth, Philosophy and Revolution -- concluded.
Alain Schurmann on Mao's China (Letter to NY)
3/67 Editorial: White Congressional Line

XII, 4 4-67 A.J. Muste, Labor and Marxist Page

XII, 5 5-67 The Role of the Intellectual: a Look Back Illuminates
Today (reprinted from July, 1956)

XII, 6 8-9, 67 Law and Order from Barrel of Gun (Editorial)
Victor Serge, Revolution's Author (TW)

XII, 7 10, 67 Instant Vulgar Materialism vs. Marxist Humanism

XII, 8 11, 67 Cha Guevara, Revolutionary (Editorial)
Block Mass Revolt: Where to Now? (TW)

XII, 9 12, 67 The House that Roared (Editorial)
Excerpts from Marxism and Freedom (TW)

XIII, 1 1, 68 Nigeria, A Retreat, Not a Victory

XIII, 2 2, 68 U.S. Bombs Devastate South Vietnam as Civil War Rages
In the Cities (Editorial Article)

XIII, 3 3, 68 Shortcut to Revolution or Long Road to Tragedy --
Review of Revolution in the Revolution?

XIII, 4 4, 68 Shortcut to Revolution... (concluded)

XIII, 5 5, 68 These Uncivilized United States: Murder of Rev. King,
Vietnam War (Editorial Article)

XIII, 6 6-7, 68 Who Arrested the French Revolution?

XIII, 7 8-9, 68 All Eyes on Czechoslovakia, All Hands Off! (Editorial
Statement)
<p>| XIII, 8 | 10, 68 | (The Current Crisis, by Ivan Svitas) |
| XIII, 9 | 11, 68 | Czechoslovakia, Revolution and Counter-Revolution -- cosigned by Raya Dunayevskaya and Harry McShane |
| XIII, 10 | 12, 68 | Kolakowski on Alienation |
| XIV, 1 | 1, 69 | Nixon, New, Old and Napoleonics (Lead) |
| XIV, 2 | 2, 69 | U.S. and Russia Enter the Middle East Cockpit (Editorial Article) |
| XIV, 4 | 4, 69 | Hegel vs. Mao: From Culture to Philosophy to Revolution |
| XIV, 5 | 5, 69 | Humanism and Marxism, Excerpts from a Lecture |
| XIV, 6 | 6-7, 69 | 75 Communist Parties Meet |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol. and No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XIV, 7</td>
<td>8-9/69</td>
<td>Splintered World Communism, Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV, 8</td>
<td>10/69</td>
<td>Critique of Althusser's anti-Hegelianism (letter of 1/22/69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV, 9</td>
<td>11/69</td>
<td>The Needed American Revolution (excerpts from 169 Perspectives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV, 10</td>
<td>12/69</td>
<td>Protests on the Detractors of Lenin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV, 1</td>
<td>1/70</td>
<td>Marxism vs. Marx's Russianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV, 2</td>
<td>2/70</td>
<td>'Two Worlds' are in Every Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV, 3</td>
<td>3/70</td>
<td>African Revolutions at the Crossroads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV, 4</td>
<td>4/70</td>
<td>Totalitarianism: U.S. Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV, 5</td>
<td>5/70</td>
<td>'True Rebirth' or Wholesale Revision of Marxism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV, 6</td>
<td>6-7/70</td>
<td>&quot;&quot; (Part 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV, 7</td>
<td>8-9/70</td>
<td>Nixon's Wars at Home and Abroad (lead editorial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV, 8</td>
<td>10/70</td>
<td>British Racism, Powellism and the Workers (excerpts from a letter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV, 9</td>
<td>11/70</td>
<td>Marx, Lenin and their Detractors (by H. McMahon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV, 10</td>
<td>12/70</td>
<td>History Rewrite Degraded Lenin, Black Masses (review of Lenin's Impact on the U.S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI, 1</td>
<td>1/71</td>
<td>reprint of special introduction to French edition of Marxism and Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI, 2</td>
<td>2/71</td>
<td>Polish uprising, protests against Russian anti-Semitism, and state-capitalist crises (lead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI, 3</td>
<td>4/71</td>
<td>What is theory? 'History and its process' (excerpts from '70 Perspectives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI, 4</td>
<td>5/71</td>
<td>'Culture', Science and State-Capitalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI, 5</td>
<td>6-7/71</td>
<td>&quot;&quot; (Part 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI, 6</td>
<td>8-9/71</td>
<td>Nixon to Peking: 'journey to peace' or to new alliance for world war? (lead editorial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI, 7</td>
<td>10/71</td>
<td>Scotland, England, France—and Marxist-Russia (letter from Europe-NW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI, 8</td>
<td>11/71</td>
<td>Mysterious book review hailed by author's reply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI, 9</td>
<td>12/71</td>
<td>The 'ground for the Nixon-We meeting (excerpts from '71 Perspectives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women's Liberation: Reason and revolutionary forces (excerpts from article in NWK)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XVII, 1 1/72 Super powers line up as war explodes between India, W. Pakistan (lead)
XVII, 2 2/72 Letter exchange blasts Marxisml slander
XVII, 3 3/72 Two forgotten pages of Ralph Bunche's life story
XVII, 4 4/72 Nixon-Mao extravaganza: new 'peaceful co-exis-
tences'—with whom? for what? (lead editorial)
XVII, 5 5/72 Women's liberation and the search for philosophy (extracts from 2/71 HEL WE conference)
XVII, 6 6-7/72 Nixon's global politicking: phase II (lead)
XVII, 7 8-9/72 Ways to combat 'pax americana' (extracts from '72 draft Perspectives)
XVII, 8 10/72 Lord Nix in and state-capitalist crisis (extracts from '72 Perspectives)
XVII, 9 11/72 Pitting 'human nature' against Marx's humanity
11/72 China-Japan Treaty (by Peter Mallory)
XVII, 10 12/72 What has happened to the Cuban Revolution? (letter of 12/60)
XVIII, 1 1/73 Russia, China bring pressure on Sauci to accept 'pax americana' (lead)
XVIII, 2 2/73 Lukacs' philosophic dimension (Part 1)
XVIII, 3 3/73 " " " (Parts 2, 3)
XVIII, 4 4/73 Mao and Nixon move closer together (lead)
XVIII, 5 5/73 Gang lawyer for the establishment (2/20/54 SW)
XVIII, 6 6-7/73 Politics of Counter-revolution: Watergate and Nixon-Kissinger's "Year of Europe" (lead editorial)
XVIII, 7 8-9/73 The New in Women's Liberation: In Fact and in Philosophy (Women's Week, UCLA, 4/73)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol. and No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVIII, 8</td>
<td>10/73</td>
<td>Exposures phase-out, global politics phase-in (excerpts from '73 Draft Perspectives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII, 9</td>
<td>11/73</td>
<td>New Introduction digests: Marx's 'Grundrisse'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/73</td>
<td>Lead: The Middle East Erupts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII, 10</td>
<td>12/73</td>
<td>The U.S.; Global politics and the Middle East war (lead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX, 1</td>
<td>1-2/74</td>
<td>War and practicing war by other means (excerpts from '73 Perspectives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX, 2</td>
<td>3/74</td>
<td>Only miners' control of safety will reduce deaths (by A. Phillips)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX, 3</td>
<td>4/74</td>
<td>...Confucius who?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX, 4</td>
<td>5/74</td>
<td>The non-conversion of Jean-Paul Sartre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX, 5</td>
<td>6/74</td>
<td>Negritude as revolution and counter-revolution (by René Depestre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX, 6</td>
<td>7/74</td>
<td>Nixon-Kissinger journey to save 'the Presidency' (lead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX, 7</td>
<td>8-9/74</td>
<td>Why Hegel? Why Now?—a critique (by P.B.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX, 8</td>
<td>10/74</td>
<td>U.S. instigations increase danger of global minefield (lead editorial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX, 9</td>
<td>11/74</td>
<td>Answer given to 'Why Hegel? Why Now?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX, 10</td>
<td>12/74</td>
<td>Dialectics of liberation: Hegel and Adorno (extracts from paper given to Hegel Society of America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX, 1</td>
<td>1-2/75</td>
<td>Deep U.S. recession and the myriad global crises (lead editorial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX, 2</td>
<td>3/75</td>
<td>How new is China's new constitution? (Part 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX, 3</td>
<td>4/75</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; (Part 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX, 4</td>
<td>5/75</td>
<td>State-capitalism and the dialectic (excerpts of speech at New School for Social Research, NY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX, 5</td>
<td>6/75</td>
<td>Socialist feminism and Marxist-Feminism (by Molly Jackson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX, 6</td>
<td>7/75</td>
<td>Instant Marxism and the Black intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX, 8</td>
<td>10/75</td>
<td>Counter-revolution and revolution: what can we do? (excerpts from '75 Perspectives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX, 9</td>
<td>11/75</td>
<td>Youth ID cards vs. youth passion for freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX, 10</td>
<td>12/75</td>
<td>Marxism and the Black Denial (excerpts from 1964 letter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI, 1</td>
<td>1-2/76</td>
<td>Under the whip of the counter-revolution: will the revolution in Portugal advance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI, 2</td>
<td>3/76</td>
<td>Middle East, UN, OAU—and ideological obfuscation (excerpts from Political-Philosophic Letter #1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI, 3</td>
<td>4/76</td>
<td>The Black dimension in Women’s Liberation (excerpts from speeches on national lecture tour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI, 4</td>
<td>5/76</td>
<td>Chicano culture, Marxism and revolution (excerpts from speech at Cal. State College, Los Angeles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI, 5</td>
<td>6/76</td>
<td>‘Women as thinkers and as revolutionaries’ (excerpts from Appendix to Working Woman For Freedom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI, 7</td>
<td>8-9/76</td>
<td>Special Introduction to Spanish edition of Marxism and Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI, 8</td>
<td>10/76</td>
<td>Death of Mao Tse-tung: the Thought of Mao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI, 9</td>
<td>11/76</td>
<td>Workers’ self-emancipation crucial to Marx (excerpts from article in Rauch, May ’76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI, 10</td>
<td>12/76</td>
<td>Post-Mao China: what now? (excerpts from Political-Philosophic Letter #6)</td>
</tr>
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<td>XXII, 1</td>
<td>1-2/77</td>
<td>Is a new world recession coming? (lead editorial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII, 2</td>
<td>3/77</td>
<td>Notes from a diary: Roots, errors, and dialectics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII, 3</td>
<td>4/77</td>
<td>New Essays: new unity of theory and practice (lecturer from colleague, Michael Connolly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII, 4</td>
<td>5/77</td>
<td>Tony Cliff degrades Lenin as theoretician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII, 5</td>
<td>6/77</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>12/77</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII, 1</td>
<td>1-2/78</td>
<td>State-lean fetishism and George Novack’s Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII, 2</td>
<td>3/78</td>
<td>War, peace or revolution: Shifting alliances in the Middle East (lead editorial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII, 3</td>
<td>4/78</td>
<td>Adorno, Kosik, and the movement from practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII, 4</td>
<td>5/78</td>
<td>‘Battle of Ideas’: a syllabus for study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII, 5</td>
<td>6/78</td>
<td>Introduction to Frantz Fanon, Soets and African Black Thought, by Charles Kennedy and Raym Dumayevshaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII, 7</td>
<td>8-9/78</td>
<td>The Latin American revolutions: where to next? (excerpts from Political-Philosophic Letter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflections on Notes from a Diary: Lenin’s Philosphic Notebooks and the State-Capitalist Tendency (excerpts)</td>
</tr>
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<td>XXIII, 8</td>
<td>10/78</td>
<td>Camp David Summit: Peace in Middle East—or extension of U.S. imperialism? (Our Life and Times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII, 9</td>
<td>11/78</td>
<td>NCL Convention: Philosophy and Organization (TW, letter from Eugene Walker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII, 10</td>
<td>12/78</td>
<td>The dialectic of today's crises and revolts (excerpts from Perspectives Thesis 1978-79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV, 1</td>
<td>1-2/79</td>
<td>Iran's revolutionary past — and present (translated into Farsi, January 1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV, 2</td>
<td>3/79</td>
<td>Marx's and Engels' Studies Contrasted: Relationship of Philosophy and Revolution to Women's Liberation (draft chapter of book-in-progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV, 3</td>
<td>4/79</td>
<td>Philosophy and Revolution: critique vs. attack (critique of PAR by G. A. Kelly vs. deceitful review by Howard Parsons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV, 5</td>
<td>6/79</td>
<td>What revolutionary ground for women's movement? (TW, excerpts from presentation on draft chapter of book-in-progress, by Eugene Walker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV, 6</td>
<td>7-9/79</td>
<td>Russia and China share global nuclear insecurity (TW reprints from Nov. '61 and Oct. '64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV, 7</td>
<td>8-9/79</td>
<td>Iran: Unfoldment of, and Contradictions in, Revolution (excerpts from Political-Philosophical Letter: translated into Farsi Aug.'79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Philip Randolph and Black labor's future (editorial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draper's narrow view of Marx's political theory (TW by Andy Phillips)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Herbert Marcuse, Marxist philosopher (in memoriam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A review of 'The Letters of Rosa Luxemburg' (TW)</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV, 9</td>
<td>11/79</td>
<td>Leon Trotsky: a critique (excerpts from a Political-Philosophic Letter; later translated into Farsi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV, 10</td>
<td>12/79</td>
<td>Grave contradictions in the Iranian revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV, 1</td>
<td>1-2/80</td>
<td>Before and after the 1905 revolution: two turning points in Rosa Luxemburg's life — 1898-99, and 1905-07 (draft chapter from book-in-progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV, 2</td>
<td>3/80</td>
<td>Dumayevskaya's response to an Iranian revolutionary (letter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV, 3</td>
<td>4/80</td>
<td>Reason and revolution vs. conformism and technology (review of Herbert Marcuse's One Dimensional Man, originally published in the Activist, Fall 1964)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV, 5</td>
<td>6/80</td>
<td>Carter's drive to war (lead editorial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/80</td>
<td>The break with Kautsky, 1910-1911: from mass strike theory to crisis over Morocco, -- and hushed-up 'Human Question' (draft chapter from book-in-progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eric Fromm, Socialist Humanist (in memoriam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carter's intrusion, Khomeini's 'Holy War' (excerpts from a Political-Philosophic Letter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alioune Diop (in memoriam)</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>XXVI, 1</td>
<td>1-2/81</td>
<td>China's 'Gang of four' trial charade and the so-called Cultural Revolution; media and the global crises (Theory/Practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI, 2</td>
<td>3/81</td>
<td>China's 'Gang of four' trial charade and the so-called Cultural Revolution; media and the global crises (Part II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI, 3</td>
<td>4/81</td>
<td>What is philosophy? What is revolution? (excerpts from Political-Philosophic Letter of Dec. 1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI, 4</td>
<td>5/81</td>
<td>Preface to Iranian edition of Marx's 1844 essays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TWO WORLDS

LETTER WRITING AND NEW PASSIONS

As we were preparing to go to press with this, our first issue, I was asked why I had placed so much emphasis on letters to and from news agencies as well as to and from workers outside these news agencies. The daily press is so well-known for its being the voice, not of the people, but of big business, that we have all but forgotten the part the press played in the making of this nation.

The worker who put this question to me, said: "All I read the newspapers and the comic strips. Were there any difference to all other sections of the paper a mere question of entertaining history, nothing much would be lost. But it is not a question of history. It is a matter of new passions as they are expressed in the daily lives of ordinary people. It is these passions that need to be heard. When fundamental changes are shaking society to its depths, the need for communication forces its way up, finds all sorts of unique ways of expression. One of these is letter writing. The world over, each stage of freedom first announced its coming in the intimate expression of the common people to each other. But it is especially characteristic of this country's development at every great turning in history. Here it was largely in the form of letters that the passions of the struggle for independence of this country from Great Britain was first formulated.

THE PRESS AND THE STRUGGLE AGAINST SLAVERY

On the question of slavery which divided the nation into two. On January 1, 1831 William Lloyd Garrison almost single-handedly published the weekly LIBERATOR. This paper, which seemed so small, was an active force which brought about the final abolition of slavery. I do not mean to put the press above the actual activities of the people. Quite the contrary. That same year a much more world-shaking event occurred than the publication of this organ of emancipation: A slave revolt led by Nat Turner shook the very foundations of the solid South which were being undermined daily by the runaway slaves. What I do mean to say is that the LIBERATOR was the expression of these new passions and forces for freedom which brought on the Civil War.

THE ONSPOKEN CONVERSATION THAT NEEDS TO BE HEARD

The American working people, with their great capacity for free association in industry and in politics, have in the press created an almost unique form of communica-

tion and inter-communication. Where an intellectual would, at best, consider letter writing a matter of "raw material," a sort of "unspoken conversation," the worker considers letters the only spoken conversation that has finally been written down to be heard.

It seldom nowadays, at this critical stage in American democracy, which seems to be in such contrast to the Communist totalitarian regime of Russia, the simple truth is that the working people have no press of their own. The daily press is in such disrepute because it reflects the views of the very people—the political leaders, the big industrialists, the labor bureaucrats—who have brought the world into the state of total, never-ending crises in which it now finds itself, while the rank and file people are not heard at all. Yet it is only in their everyday world that you will find the elements of a new society, a new human being to whom his relations with his fellow workers, his acts against the labor bureaucracy as well as against the boss, his relations with his family and his neighbors mean more to him than the fact that he can buy a car and a television.

What is needed above all is a workers' paper, one written, edited and circulated by workers themselves. It is not true that the middle class—intellectuals, housewives, technicians—are welcome, as is any and every part of the population that has nothing whatever to do with the two gigantic bureaucracies struggling for world domination, American as well as Russian. But the first necessity is that the rank and file have the paper in their hands to say what they want to, how they want to.

It is in the expression of the working people, on whose backs the total weight of world capitalism rests, that we will find the new passions and forces for a new society. All the others may depend as to the change but they are not so strategically placed in production that they can stop its wheel or change its course.

TODAY'S READERS AND TOMORROWS

Old radicals, in starting a paper, used to say: "But their fear of being captured by the "outsiders" was so strong that they felt the need for all sorts of controls and hence special privileges for those on the "inside." We feel no such need. Hence the emphasis on by-laws from those outside the news committees that are issuing this paper now. In truth, the only way this paper can be established is if the readers take matters into their own hands—themselves write and edit and circulate this paper. Today's readers and tomorrow's.
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TWO WORLDS

THE REVOLT IN THE SLAVE LABOR CAMPS IN YORKUTA

Today marks the second anniversary of the most unprecedented strike in the world—the revolt in Russian slave labor camps in Yorkuta. The outstanding part of the strike is that it ever took place at all. No one on inside or outside of the Kremlin, the seat of Russian Government in Moscow—nor even the prisoners themselves who were to organize this strike—thought such a thing possible in their wildest dreams. Yet, a few short weeks after the East German revolt on June 17, 1953, these same prisoners were inspired to strike out on their own.

MYTH OF INVINCIBILITY DESTROYED

Nothing so shows the uncertainty and insecurity of those totalitarian rulers, armed to the teeth and with all the power and terror in their hands, as the caution with which the Government at first dealt with the strike. They sent a commission, headed by General Derevianko, to fly down to the camp. When he tried to harangue the prisoners and failed, the commission returned to Moscow with the demands of the prisoners for a review of all their cases and the removal of the barbed wire. In the end, the Kremlin did what the Tzar had done back in 1912: they opened fire on the unarmed strikers and killed some 200. But they could not put up what the strikers had destroyed: the myth of invincibility.

These prisoners without any rights had dared to strike. They held out for weeks, shaking the Kremlin to its very foundations. Despite total censorship, the workers in Leningrad knew of any of the strike. A few months after, students from the Leningrad Mining Institute, working in the pits in Yorkuta, told the prisoners how everyone had talked of the strike in Leningrad: "We soon got to know you were on strike. The drop in coal was noticeable at once. We don't have any reserves. There's just the plan, that's all. And everyone knows how vulnerable plans are. It destroyed the myth that the system was unassailable."

THE SILENCE OF "THE WEST"

A meeting "at the summit" is being ballyhooed now, and a meeting of the Big Four Ministers, took place then. The upshot of it was that they achieved such a silence on the question of the revolt during that conference in West Berlin as in Moscow. Dr. Joseph Scholmer tells us that story in a most remarkable book called Yorkuta.

Dr. Scholmer was one of thousands of slave laborers released during the Big Four Ministers Conference in 1953. He has this to say of the Western "experts" on Russia:

"When I first mentioned the word, 'civil war' to those people they were appalled. The possibility of a rising lay outside their realm of comprehension. They had no idea that there were resistance groups in the camps..."

"I talked to all sorts of people in the first few weeks after my return from the Soviet Union. It seemed to me that the man in the street had the best idea of what was going on. The experts seemed to understand nothing."

ON BOTH SIDES OF THE IRON CURTAIN

It was not for lack of understanding that the Western rulers acted as they did. Quite the contrary. I remember that when Stalin died, one worker in Flint said: "What is the use of all this talk against Russia when Eisenhower sends the Russian leaders his sympathy?"

Over at the other end of the world from Flint, in the Russian slave labor camps, the same degum with Western leaders swept the Russian resistance movement. For years there have been underground resistance groups, mainly Ukrainian. Prior to June 17th, all the preparations for resistance to the totalitarian rulers were based on the eventuality of war and looked to the Western rulers. When Stalin died in March, 1953, hope spread through the camps. But all that came from the Eisenhowers and Churchill were condolences to the Russian leaders who continued the Stalin regime. Glencos spread throughout the slave labor camps until the June 17th revolt in East Germany showed that liberation can be achieved only by the workers themselves. The Russian political prisoners followed up with their revolt.

The strike in July, 1953, could not have occurred without the previous underground formation of resistance groups within the camps. But the strike as it occurred was entirely different from the action planned when they looked to "the West." June 17th had changed all that.

The sabotage and treachery of the West seemed to astound some. But one of the Russian resistance leaders put it in a nutshell:

"These radio stations are controlled by the various governments, aren't they? Well, on June 17 they had to ask the government officials what they were to do. And the government officials have a prefixed list of popular slogans, wherever they take place."
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TWO WORLDS

NEW STAGE OF STRUGGLE AGAINST LABOR BUREAUCRACY

The series of wildcat strikes, right on the heels of the new contracts in auto negotiated by Reuther, was a strike against the labor bureaucracy. Pure and simple;asd and sad. Never before had the opposition to the labor leadership been so total. Without understanding this, it is impossible to understand "the politics" of the American working people.

Judging, no doubt, by the fact that their threat for leadership remained unquelled, certain intellectuals who fancy themselves as workers' leaders were talking at one end of the line about the "political backwardness" of the American worker while they themselves were accepting Reuther's self-avowed victory as "the fulfillment of the workers' dream." The auto workers, on the other hand, stuck to the picket lines.

Their talk on the picket lines revealed a new attitude in Reuther. His name was seldom stung out at all. "The international" — the labor leadership — was seen as a unit. Every one from the lowest organizer to Reuther was referred to as "a representative of management." The workers would have nothing to do with any of them. They listened only to those who were with them in the strike.

NEW FORMATIONS

New groupings were on the border of that activity. In one local, the rank and file simply walked to the back of the hall while the leadership sat on the platform. When they had come to a decision, they then confronted the empty platform with it. In another shop where the production workers were all women, while the executives and the union leadership were men, the struggle assumed the form of a woman's fight without the involvement of the men. In several shops, there was no secretaries to work them so they went on strike. This is how the hunger for the daily of personnel and action, which is on the picket line, expressed itself.

The self-confidence they gained in taking matters into their own hands is first now evoking into new group formations. Where, a decade ago, there could fulfill itself at the head of the strike wave following the conclusion of World War II. Now, most workers even had from the start in mind at the shops. Where, a few years ago, he could fight the police by the virus, this present revolts was no leaders, so organizing, or that Reuther had no other weapon left but to show that the long-awaited workers' grievances were "personal."

In going to this, the workers' insuperable attitude toward their leadership showed how far they had gone beyond the stage ofexcluding one set of leaders by another as in the days when union executors were so popular. This type of politics they knew to the leadership. Distinctively, workers politics concerns itself instead with realities at the point of production itself. This is why this time they were so little interested in personalism, Reuther's and Stalin's included.

WHY DO THEY BEHAVE LIKE THEY DO?

That was why it was necessary for Reuther to bring all of those professors in, and turn the class struggle upside down.

A production worker with many years of trade union experience asked me this question, and then continued, "Why do you turn to those guys to carry out his objectives? I know he always used intellectuals, but there is something new this time. It seems to me that this time they are using him. Why, even the top international representatives didn't get into that room, fully of professors and engineers. That is why it seems to me the workers are not thinking so much of forms of organizations as of forms of revolt; a way of getting rid of all that planning by people who haven't spent a single day on the production line."

REUTHER AND PLANS

Nevertheless Reuther and Pinto have always been a pair, an inseparable pair. That was true of him even when he was a worker himself and helped organize the CIO. Always his aim was "to lead" so that when the American working class was changing the industrial face of America, he was attracted most of all by the administrative plan of Russia. In the early 1920's he had worked there for a year and, while the Russian production worker saw or was not a speedup, this skilled American worker saw only the gray days then.

It is true that the tendency to plan did not then seem as, that is, an idea of the very organization of this skilled worker-intellectual. It was only when Russia moved from depression to war and the totalitarianism of the crime that a frightful task for the labor leaders who wanted to continue to lead above all else, that the Plan became so characteristically the mark of the American labor bureaucracy.

First Reuther came out with the plan for more plants. He challenged industry's ability to transfer itself rapidly to a wartime basis. That this composition with industry for state approval meant that the worker would be thrown down with a non-strike pledge, did not discourage Reuther a bit. He didn't have to work on the production line. He had his table of blueprints. He seemed flexible enough when the tidal wave of strikes, at the end of World War II, threatened to overwhelm the whole labor bureaucracy. He placed himself at the head of the strike and came out with such slogans as "Open the Books." From opposite poles, both workers and management, interpreted this as a call to industry's center of power to open the books to let the workers see their plan called for an end to strikes. He soon enough got the slogan so tied into the "sweeping up of wages" that it became nothing but a bookkeeping term.

What he had done during the war with the no strike pledge, and in 1932 with the New Year Contract, he now did with the workers' wage for security in the face of automation. In the face of automation, on the one hand, and the workers' demands for a share in the production profits, on the other hand, Reuther puts the New Deal brain, that used to be in the government pay-roll, on the union payroll, and comes up with Reuther's number of combinations, that is to say, transferring something into its very opposite.

WORKERS POLITICS

WORKERS POLITICS

That is why the opposition to Reuther now is so total. What form this workers' revolt will take, no one can tell in advance. What cannot be counted now is the workers' determination to find other ways, than through their present leadership, to bend production to their will and ambition for a better life. That is the workers' politics. All other politics they leave to the politicians and intellectual planners.
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TWO WORLDS

SOCIALISM OR BARRABISM

ON THE PROBLEM OF A WORKERS' PAPER

I have read of the July-September issue of the French magazine, Socialisme ou Barbarie (Socialism or Barbarism), and see that it is largely devoted to the problem of establishing a workers' paper. The article by B. Malhe on the question shows the workers' paper. The article by B. Malhe on the question deals with the experience of some French workers who published a shop paper, in Nantes, which is like Ford here, and the experience we have had an America in publishing a workers' paper.

All this is new. Herefore socialists and other radicals have been content with publishing a paper for workers rather than by them. The fact that some now pose the latter question and pose it with the non-essential characteristic of the theoretical journal, is a beginning in the direction in which we have worked for some years before the actual publication of NEWS & LETTERS.

THE SPECIAL PROBLEM OF WESTERN EUROPE

The conditions in France, however, are radically different from these here. We do not have a mass Communist Party to agree us. The Communist Party of France (and even more so of Italy, it must not be forgotten) is a strong force. It controls the largest trade union—the CGT—which is like the CIO here.

No socialist grouping like Socialisme ou Barbarie can disregard such a mass force as the Communist Party represents there. It cannot speak to workers on any subject as if the problem were only of workers against exploiters. It is a struggle within the working class; the counter-revolutionary force is within the revolutionary movement. The problem of establishing a workers' paper in France is a question only the French can decide.

OUR EXPERIENCE

But, instead of the struggle the world over today is a struggle against bureaucratic domination, and the fundamental problem of workers the world over, in this age of bureaucratization, is the task of the problem not the day after but today, our experience can illuminate the problem.

The working class stumps in the overall setting and the decentralization in the editing of the individual sections—Labor, Negro, Women, Youth—did not come about accidentally. They were the results of the decision of a unique combination of worker and intellectual. NEWS & LETTERS, being a product of this unique combination of worker and intellectual, is in its own small way to be sure, the prototype of the breakthrough of the most monstrous division of all—the division between mental and manual labor which has reached its apex in this epoch.

This trend of any class society also stamps many people who align themselves with the working class, but have no conception of how that the opposition to the old order must be not alone in theory, but, in practice. This characteristic is not limited to intellectuals, but permeates a stratum of the working class. For the classic example of that we must consider not the comparatively small problem of a workers' paper, but the historic problem of workers' power itself. As it was in the period of the workers' state in Russia (1917-1923) when all the problems of today were seen as if in a blinding light, and grasped at once by Lenin.

WHAT HISTORY TEACHES US

Before 1917 all radicals saw the problem of a new society, the problem of achieving political power. What the Russian experience showed was that the problem first then began.

Shlyapnikov was a worker who had joined the Bolshevik (Communist) Party long before the Russian Revolution of which he was a leader. Nevertheless, once power was achieved, he refused to see the problem of worker and intellectual—which is another way of saying the role of the party.

Lenin, on the other hand, saw precisely this division as the barrier—the last barrier—that the old decrete society was setting up to the path of the new workers' state that had won power but was nevertheless heading back to capitalism. He insisted on two seemingly contradictory policies: 1) He said they must define the term, worker, "in such a way as to include only those who could have acquired a proletarian mentality from their very position in life," by which he meant that they were workers all their life, that they had worked in heavy industry at least 10 years, that they were factory workers not through choice but because they had no other way of earning a living.

2) Nevertheless he showed that the proletariat policy of the party was the result of "the erroneous undisciplined prestige enjoyed by the thin stratum which may be called the old guard of the Party, Only a very slight internal struggle within this stratum would be sufficient, if not to destroy this prestige, then at all events to weaken it so much as to make the power to determine policy." And so it was and the workers' state crumbled altogether.

ONCE AGAIN ON PUBLISHING A WORKERS' PAPER:

To return from the historic height to the problem raised by our French friends, I cannot see how the theoreticians can continue to theorize in the old way while the workers in their various activities break through old patterns to new theory. Just as it is true that the workers, in a workers' paper, do not speak only of their relations at the point of production, but all of their ideas on life, labor and the new world. It is true that the intellectuals' role cannot be just to generalise the experience, but must be to discipline himself to hear all the workers say instead of hearing only what fits into his previous theoretical patterns.

Workers' actions speak for them without equivocation. The intellectual must be attuned to hear that movement from practice to theory. That is the mark.

I would say that the tendency to say: "A workers' paper, yes, but, in that case it must come from the workers themselves, and not from us the theoreticians," is an evasion of the task at hand. Theoreticians cannot be bystanders to a paper that directs the workers' thoughts and activities as they happen. We would like to hear more from our West European friends.
TWO WORLDS

NEW TURN TO THE "POPULAR FRONT"

Like a road marker, Russian Communist boss Khruchov has been tracing a turning point in world history. The decade is impressive enough. I do not mean to say it is just an empty shell. No one like Khruchov is to be dismissed out of hand. He is the man who coached General Zhukov to tell his "soldier friend," President Eisenhowe, the "true story" of Russia's highest political body, the Political Bureau, of which Zhukov is not even a member.

Naturally, Eisenhowe is not letting himself be diverted into any direction he doesn't wish to follow. He has allowed Khruchov to be impressed with "the new concepts of leadership" which has replaced Stalin's dictatorship, because he is compelled to play the part of "we're-brothers-under-the-skin-where-peace-is-concerned."

The political difference between the bodies of the two powers aiming for world conquest — America and Russia — is that the Russians are masters not only of governmental shows, but also of what is known as the "Popular Front" — a non-governmental get-together of assorted charlatans who cut across both the working class and the middle class.

I have been looking through my diary the instances of this specifically Russian creation which Stalin invented back in the 1920s when he moved to "building problems in a single country." The more familiar name for "Popular Front" is "collective security." This has an official, governmental flavor and does not disclose the Commissar Party tactics as readily.

Let me say that this problem does not exist in the 1950s because we now know all about it thanks to the ex-Communists who recently turned informers.

It is not a matter of having alliances with the American flag to the Russian flag, though there may be that on the part of some. For every converted or alleged "conspirator" there was an honorable intellectual who filled with the Communist "idea" and who is presently as opposed to Russian communism as is possible for intellectuals without roots in the working class.

That's just it. There is no total opposition except from the workers who alone can change things from the roots up because they are the sticks that on the basis of what they are taken place.

THE 1923 CRASH AND THE AMERICAN MIND

With the 1923 crash, production had come nearly to a standstill. Millions of workers were thrown into the streets. Now that everyone saw that production is primary, the class lines became not weaker, but stronger. The New Deal is proof enough that the capitalist class too had suffered a moral split. Every serious tension between the working class and the capitalist class produces a rift in the camp of the ruling class itself. But that is not irreversible.

To run production in capitalist society, the rulers sit upon the direct producers. When there is a crisis, these bureaucrats do not get off the workers' backs. They sit the harder. The New Deal did not temper with that relationship at the point of production. Neither did the intellectual planners who come out of Harvard and Columbia, Yale and Princeton, the College of the City of New York and the University of Chicago.

Just as there are only two fundamental classes in society — the working class and the capitalist class — so there are only two fundamental ways of thinking. The 1929 crash, which shook the world to its foundations, cut sharply across the American mind, splitting it into two opposing parties.

1) The Brain Trust, or intellectuals planners, small and large. Those who invented the New Deal to save capitalism and those who wanted to use the New Deal to move headlong to total planning according to the Russian model, were not so totally different from each other that they did not find collaboration pleasant. Both had one word for all theills in the world. It was Plans.

2) On the other hand, the rank and file workers tried to recognize production on entirely new foundations by demanding that these who labor should control production. They too, had but one word to describe how to do it. It was: SIT DOWN. The very spontaneous of the action overflowed into the organization of the CIO.

THE AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL ADAPT

While the workers were creating organizations of their own, characteristically American and specifically working class, the American intellectual was adrift, drifting into the Commissar-created Popular Front. The Russian Communists had a hold day, penetrating everywhere from the Newsweek through to the Saturday Evening Post. They were the labor bureau in Detroit to filmset in Hollywood. The American intellectual was an unwilling victim. He gradually tried to influence the American worker. If he failed it was not his fault. The American intellectual was in common with all intellectuals: he broke down upon the native working class as "backward." But while the Communist Party of the United States took over the American intellectual bodily, emotionally and financially, it remained without serious root among the American working class.

THE TOTALITY OF THE CRISIS

The world crisis is creating another field day for the Communist bureaucrats in this country. One day a production worker pointed out to me that the labor bureau is an agency of the "knowledge" of Communism, that already they have been caught off guard by the actions of the Communists in defending the status quo and in stopping some of the actions of the workers against Capital. Politics makes strange bedfellows.

The one thing evident in all this is the solid common sense of the American worker. He is showing a total disillusion of the shocked out of Geneva through the jails and over the air. Rather he is showing a total anger for the indiscriminate blow of what happens day in and day out, at the point of production.
Conflict Behind Peace Talks

So overpowering is the anti-war feeling among the peoples of the world that they compelled a meeting between the American government and the Russian, despite the unwillingness of both.

Ten years after World War II ended and the cold war began, the complete sterility of power politics was revealed by the empty and perpetual smiles on the faces of the Big Two at the Conference of the Big Four. Germany, the key to the European situation, was not there at all. Shattered to anhierarchical is any illusion about disarmament.

The United States delegation, a few months back, EisenhowerRussia sent its minister of war, General Zhukov, as their expert on disarmament.

"I know that the Geneva conference was an empty show," an auto worker told me. "But I can't afford to laugh. They're playing with our lives. Communism in my shop have already changed their line. They're beginning to sound like the Salvation Army at Christmas time."

When America and Russia were together in World War II, I remember these comrades for the no-strike pledge and speed-up. They were the biggest producers. Eisenhower doesn't fool me, but what are the Russians up to? ... THE SITUATION IN RUSSIA...

It is not so hard to fathom Russia. Take the present crisis in Russian agriculture.

The Russian worker knew this was behind the fall of Premier Malenkov in February. The American experts said: 'Stalin fell because he was 'too' light industry heavy industry.'

Khruschev was 'for' heavy industry. The Russian worker knew the crisis came because the Government couldn't even assure sufficient food for the population. Fully 70 percent of his meager budget goes for food. The shortage of oil, but there wasn't sufficient bread and potatoes in the stores, let alone shoes and radios.

Soviet agriculture has been stagnating for 25 years. Official government figures claim a tenfold increase in heavy industry in the last quarter of a century; but they show that grain is now only at the 1928 per capita level. The per capita level of meat and milk has declined 30 percent. This total failure in agriculture is shaking the regime to its foundations.

TRANSFORMING NATURE BY DEGREE

What to do? Khruschev had a plan. He always has a plan. Each time it is more gigantic than the time before. Our readers may know little of the Stalin Plan for the Transformation of Nature of 1948-1950. That is the plan Khruschev is now reviving under a different name.

When Stalin was alive, they wrote songs about his irrigation projects which would "soon" produce enough food to feed 150 million people. But nothing came of it. Absolutely nothing.

The following year, 1949, Stalin brought Khruschev to Moscow. Another fantastic scheme was born: to shah, by decree, the difference between country and city. The ruling bureaucracy ordered the establishment of agro-urban, or "agricultural towns." Between 1950 and 1952, 550,000 collective farms were forcibly merged. These merged, far from producing agricultural products, each change on the country side, that the plan stipulated.

The peasant refused to transport, at his own expense and on his own time, his little hut from the collective farm to the agro-town. Especially since the apartment house in which he was to live like an industrial worker had not even been planed, let alone built.

TRANSFORMING PEOPLE BY DEGREE

The Stalin plan aimed at "transforming" farmers into city workers. The 1954-56 Khruschev plan aims at changing city workers into farmers. The Russian totalitarian bureaucracy is ordering a mass transportation of people to cultivate the virgin land in the wilds of Siberia and the Urals.

In Russia, youth are compelled to take state training from six months to two years. These are called State Labor Reserves. In exchange for this, they are obligated to work for the State for the next four years "at the prevailing rate of pay," wherever the State sends them.

From these labor reserves, Khruschev sent 350,000 "volunteers." In addition, he has sent demobilized units of the Army who showed an alarming degree of restlessness.

Also, he sent experienced machine tractor station operators who were promised an especially big bonus for work in Siberia and the Urals.

Into these arid lands the state has made phenomenal investments--12 billion rubles in 1955, 21 billion in 1956, and 25 billion in 1957. This sum is more than half of what is invested in heavy industry and only five times as much as that invested...
in light, food and tobacco Industry— a mere 10.8 billion. They plan to plough up some 32 million acres of virgin lands. They have now increased this to the fantastic figure of 70 million additional acres for the three years, 1964, 1965 through 1966.

In the early 1960s, when Russia first turned to mass production, Henry Ford was the model. Now the model is the American farming technique. The Khrushchev speech at the beginning of the year, which overshadowed Malenkov’s fall, was full of praise for American farming techniques.

Malenkov must have thought it to be a gamble when all they can know for certain is that if the rains are plentiful, the gamble will pay off this year. These lands, now being ploughed up are marginal. In the next year or two they may become dustbowls.

Russia is the only industrialized country where as much as half of the population is still engaged in agriculture. At present the rulers are trying nothing short of reversing the historic trend towards industry to absorb the displaced farming population. They are sending the urban population—youth, de-mobilized soldiers and skilled tractor drivers— into the country. So fatal is the crisis in Russia that, after 25 years of alleged sovietisation, the state-capitalist bureaucracy has no other way of assuring bread for the population.

AUTOMATION, THE PLAN AND THE WORKER

On the eve of the Geneva Conference, an All-Union Conference of Industrial Personnel was held. Who should address it but the ever present Khrushchev. He seems to be everywhere at the same time. He appears at a conference in the Ukraine to urge an increase in the yield of sugar beets. He appears at a Conference with Titov in Yugoslavia. He is presently at the Conference of the Big Four in Geneva. At the All-Union Conference, he spoke of the need to change from “short term” (Five Year) planning to “long range” planning. On the basis of his speech, a new decree was issued: Reorganization of Industry Planning. A new Ministry was created.

All that week, the official papers, Pravda and Komsomol, ran articles on: WHAT IS HOLDING BACK AUTOMATION?

The conference itself included “An Appeal to All Workers, Engineers, Technicians and Employees in the Soviet Union” to learn from the experience of the production innovators.”

Note the awkward phrase: “production innovators.” It is a high sounding phrase for speed demons. They dare not create another Stakhanov—the production pace-setter of the 1930’s. It was not uncommon for some local Stakhanov to find himself murdered. Now it is “production innovators” the Russian workers are ordered to emulate. But—by whatever name, the Russian worker knows it all comes from the sweat of his brow. The low productivity of the Russian worker is the measure of his resistance to the totalitarian regime. At the same time, collective farm hedges, are being pierced in the countryside while in the city there is a serious wave of juvenile delinquency.” There is no escape from the totality of the crisis. That is what sent the Russian rulers to Geneva.

AS FOR THE UNITED STATES

Lest anyone think that the United States where “free enterprise—capitalism” rules, is free from crisis, let them take another look at our country. Ever since the 1929 crash we have moved in the same general direction that Russia did: from crisis to war to revolution and unto the brink of another war. That is what sent the American rulers to Geneva.

The state-capitalist bureaucrats in Russia cannot imagine any problem which they cannot solve by a blueprint. The private capitalist bureaucrats cannot imagine any problem that the dollar cannot solve. A few days back, all the financial experts in this country, complained that the Geneva Conference had pushed the Report of the President’s Economic Cabinet of Advisers off of the front pages. This report sounded very much like the 1929 babble of endless prosperity on the very eve of the stock market crash.

Let us for the moment disregard the signs of crisis in this country. Let us turn our heads from inflation and the billions of dollars in installment buying; from the millions already displaced by automation; from the beginnings of another serious unemployment. In short, from the fact that in free-enterprise, prosperous, highly-mechanized American agriculture, Governmental price supports are still needed to keep the crisis from showing.

For the present, let us take this report of prosperity at face value.

The question to be answered is: why did this report play a part in the fiddle to the Geneva Conference? We have the word of the financial editor of the Republican New York Herald Tribune that it is “the universal guest for pesos.”

For once, he is right.

Look at the people in town who poured out in thousands to welcome the visiting Russian farm delegation. That was the biggest demonstration since Eisenhower’s victory parade at the end of World War II. Eisenhower may out-smile Khrushchev.
but he is not Khrushchev's equal at creating "popular counts of all classes for peace." (See TWO WORLDS, p. 5.)

WHERE THE REAL
PROBLEM LIES

The problem is not of antagonism between America and Russia. The problem exists within every country. It is the problem of relations between people. It is the relation of the worker at the point of production to the bureaucracy that dominates him in his own country. Here again, the crisis in Russia will help illuminate the problem in America.

Top Russian scientists are singing the glores of automation and are exhorting their fellow-scientists "to get closer to life" because "the detachment of scientists from production hinders the fruitful cooperation between scientists and practical workers."

That, no doubt, is true. But it isn't anyone's personal or individual fault. There is nothing subjective or personal about the division between manual and mental work. This separation between mental and manual work is the very foundation on which capitalism rests, whatever its form. It has its roots in the division of society by the work of the state. Automation will not erase the division. It has brought the division to the breaking point. Nothing can stop the movement of contemporary society to utter collapse.

The law of motion cannot be reversed so long as production is at the expense of the worker. The only thing that can reverse this movement is the release of the energies of the working people working for themselves: Working in a productive system "where the motive force is the development of the individual and not of the machine or of profit."

The American worker is not as poor as the Russian worker, but much more is at stake than the rate of pay. Our dollar-minded politicians and intellectuals have never understood, and do not yet understand, what the problem of the modern working class movement was 100 years ago. The crisis of production—and hence of society—lies in this: The worker, seeking his dignity and freedom, "his payment high or low," will oppose a mode of production which makes the worker nothing but a cog in a machine.

Today's political and intellectual leaders look for the root of the world crisis everywhere except at the relations of people at the point of production. The center of gravity has not moved from there just because they have called a conference at Geneva. Nor will launching satellites in space solve the problems of this earth.

"Can mankind survive?" is not a question posed by the H-bomb. Working people have been asking this question ever since 20 million of them were thrown on the streets during the Depression more than 30 years ago.

"Can mankind be free?" is the question the working people are now asking. They ask, "If not only of one party, of state bureaucrats like the Russians. They ask it of those leaders, who have led this country with reaction to slavery, laws that millions of Americans would fear to sign their names to the
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In spite of all the Labor Day speeches hailing the forthcoming unity between AFL and CIO, never has there been such a division between workers and the union leaders. This underlying unrest has encouraged the caucus builders.

I am reminded of a typical opposition-caucus leader, Bert Cochran. Recently, one of Cochran's followers claimed to have "the best anti-Buffalo caucus in Ohio." During the depression, Cochran was a student at the College of the City of New York. It was when young intellectuals like Cochran joined the strike movement of the workers and the unemployed and gave it "leadership." In 1934 when he was active in the famous Auto-Lite strike in Toledo, Ohio, Cochran met some Trotskyists to whom he was greatly attracted as "theoreticians" of the class struggle. Where the Russian Revolution of 1917 made James P. Cannon, the founder of American Trotskyism, break with the Industrial Workers of the World and accept the doctrine of "a vanguard party to lead the workers to power," the American crisis in the 1930's made Cochran accept the doctrine of the party to lead the workers.

His glib tongue and facile pen soon made him a "specialist" in trade union work. But Cochran's specialty was not to organize masses, but cliques. WORKERS, UNION LEADERS AND RADICALS

The average worker was in the struggle for unionization because he wanted a total change in the conditions of work and the relations at work. The workers were ingenious in the ways they devised to fight the corporations and the fledgling bureaucracy. To keep themselves in leadership, the young labor bureaucracy was in need of an ideology, a system of ideas that would attract these workers. This is where the radicals came in. They wrote the programs for the union leaders. Homer Martin's was being written by Jay Lovestone; Wyndham Mortimer's by the Communist Party; Reuther's, it was generally believed, was also written by the C.P.

When GM first recognized the UAW it still had no intention of taking the union seriously enough to let the workers decide the conditions of work. Immediately there was a division between the union leadership and the union ranks as to how to enforce the contract. The workers took the road of "quickies." Homer F. Martin, president of the UAW, opposed wildcats.

When the C.P. succeeded in prying Martin's first contract (Frankfurter) away from him, Bert Cochran saw his chance to play a leading role. He came to Martin with a 20-point program which ranged from a fight against the "big corporations" to fighting Communist "collective security." In a word, Martin got from Cochran the program to fight the Communists and Cochran got from Martin the post of UAW-WPA director.

The partnership didn't last long. At the very first strike Martin fired Cochran. That was a lucky thing for Cochran for Martin was soon to bolt the CIO. Cochran never worked with the rank and file of the union for whom he had nothing but contempt. The few times he worked in the shop, he was known to the workers as a sloppy worker, one whom they had to carry. But on the platform or in the caucus room, he talked down to them. He was as cynical as any labor bureaucrat from the union around his lips, the slouch of his shoulders, to the thumb point in the audience as his voice rose to a roar. THE PARTY LEADER AND THE LABOR BOSS

A petty type like Cochran respects neither fundamental ideas nor rank and file people. He responds only to his own restlessness and to that bureaucracy which gives him a little hope that he can function as a leader. About two years ago, he glimpsed some hope for the future in the "reform" proposed by that all-but-forgotten Russian, Malenkov. Claiming to understand "the reality of this world, and this country, and this labor movement," he led a group of dissident Trotskyists into an organization of his own which would "cut a path for itself in the next struggle and developments."

This sudden involvement in international politics had nothing whatever to do either with actual world events or theoretical developments. What was bothering Cochran was not Europe, but the United States; not Communists, but the native labor bureaucracy. So long as the trade union leaders needed these radicals to write their programs, Cochran, the petty intellectual, was satisfied. But the period following World War II is one of total crisis, and no time to play at radical politics. The labor bureaucracy cleaned house, throwing out not only the Communists but the Trotskyists from all union positions. And Cochran began to display the signs of a well-known political type - the man who is desperately determined to get out from where he is.

Accordingly, he is now busy trying to build an opposition caucus. This "caucus" is reaped from the theory of a party to lead the masses.
TENSIONS WITHIN THE SOVIET UNION

Russia has suddenly become the most popular tourist attraction for traveling U.S. Senators. Among the most recent tourists have been: Sen. Estes Kefauver, Democrat from Tennessee; Sen. John J. Sparkman, Democrat from Alabama; and Sen. George W. Malone, Republican from Nevada. They have lost no time in giving their expert impressions.

Sen. Malone stated that he found "no evidence the people are going to rise against the Soviet regime." This ridiculous pretension underlines the intelligence of the American people and stands the Russians' winning struggle against their totalitarian regime. The truth is:

CONTINUOUS REvolt BY RUSSIAN WORKERS

1929 TO 1938

1) Throughout the First and Second Five-Year Plans (1928-1938) workers left the plants and returned to their farms with a disregard for capitalist routines very similar to the Southern production workers in Northern United States.

2) The passport system accomplished as little in disciplining the workers as had the 1032 laws which authorized the factory director to fire a worker for absences and even to deprive him of his food card and living quarters owned by the factory.

3) It was impossible to decree slavery. The Russian worker, like the American worker, knows how to handle his job. Where he is forbidden to strike, he shows down. The Senators and scholars speak of "low labor productivity" in Russia as if that means the Russian workers are backward. Like the economists in the United States in relation to American workers, however, the Russian intelligentsia recognizes low productivity for what it is: a sign of revolt against the conditions of production. Figures show that to complete the First Plan, even in half-way fashion, 22.3 million workers were used where the Plan called for only 15.7 million. Labor turnover was no less than 155 per cent.

4) The totalitarian rulers have more power than any other government in history. Nevertheless, they did not feel capable of disciplining this rebellious labor force. They decided instead to divide it by finding some social basis in the factory among a special section of the workers. American workers who have seen another operating with the skilled tradesmen will have no difficulty in understanding what Stalin was aiming at.

As early as 1931, Stalin called for the "liquidation of personalism." This was a very funny phrase for a very ugly truth. He had no factory personalities to defend his regime. To get them, he decided to give the skilled worker a personality and a wage to go with it and at the same time transform the skilled worker into a speed demon for one day. This man set the rate of speed, through specially good machines and plenty of help, at a pace which he knew he would have to keep up for only a single day. This time-study then became the rate for the rest of the workers to produce every day.

This speed-up movement and with such resistance that it was not unusual for Stakhanovites to find themselves murdered in the dark of night.

1940 TO 1950

At the start of World War II, the laws of June 26 and October 2, 1940, forbade a worker to leave his job and punished 15 minutes' absence with six months' "corrective labor" - labor in the factory with 25 per cent reduction in pay.

Yet, after six months of operation of these laws, PRAVDA reported that turnouts were greater than in the three months prior to it. Martial law was declared on the railroads similar to Truman's proposal to draft railroad workers to prevent their strike in 1943.

In 1943, the conveyor belt system was first introduced. On the basis of assembly line discipline, the State introduced competition by factories. This means the factory, for instance, is ordered to challenge Factory Molotov. Factory Molotov must take up the challenge "to fulfill and overfulfill" its quarterly plan by 10 per cent. All workers in both factories must pitch into this back-breaking State-ordered plan. This is called "socialist emulation". IN VORKUTA

Finally, in 1953, what had been going on continuously, the slow labor camps under the surface for years, exploded into the open with the revolt of prisoners in the slave labor camps at Vorkuta. (See "TWO WORLDS", July 8, 1953.) Despite false censorship, workers in far-off Leningrad knew of the revolt at once and applauded.

Day in and day out, for 20 solid years, the Russian workers have been upholding his existence. Had the revolt not been so continuous, the terror would not have been so violent. The millions of forced labor camps are a true measure of the never-ending existence of the Russian workers to their oppressors.
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"UNDERGROUND WAYS"

Dorothy, a Negro miner's wife, was showing me an article about the Mau Mau in a magazine. She was very upset, not alone about Kenya, but about conditions in this country. So far as she could see, it is not only the British in Africa where the white man is using every barbaric device to keep himself in power and to perpetuate the slavery of the black man.

"They would do it here, if they could," she said. They do it in the South. They just use underground ways to do it, that's all.

The words, "underground ways," startled me. I looked at her as she continued with her story: "Once in a while it comes out in the open, like the lynching of the Chicago boy down in Mississippi. But I'm not talking about that. I am talking about what the white man does to the black man down there every single day of the year; every year of his life.

"We went to visit our folks down in Alabama this year and we almost got killed. A white woman driver was trying to push us off the road. Though it was a wide, four-lane highway with little traffic on it, she came so close to our car that we would have landed in a ditch if we hadn't stopped the car. My husband wanted to get out and fight, but I said, 'What's the use? She only has to yell 'cop' or something. They have their sneaky, underground ways.'"

ON BOTH SIDES OF THE IRON CURTAIN

As I listened to Dorothy, I began to contrast the ease with which she moved from subject to subject, while I had not been able to broach the subject I had come to discuss—a book on Karl Marx, the founder of the modern working class movement.

I was particularly struck by her expression, "underground ways," because a great conspiracy is also afoot on both sides of the Iron Curtain to transform Marxism, the theory of the liberation of the working class, into its complete opposite, a theory of exploitation and tyranny.

The Russian Government, on its side, spends millions trying to pin the label of "Russian Communism" to the doctrine of Karl Marx. The American Government is helping Russia on this side of the Atlantic. In all its laws and propaganda it also deals with the two opposites, Marxism and Russian Communism, as if they were one and the same thing.

Nothing could be further from the truth, but the truth is the last concern of the political leaders on either side of the Iron Curtain.

The struggle for world domination, in which these two poles of world capital are engaged, cannot occur by force alone. They must try to win the mind of man. Russia takes incredible care and patience to claim Marxism. Just as the labor bureaucracy in America is always evading the answer how it came to be and, instead, tells you what the CIA was when it challenged the rule of G.M. Ford, U.S. Steel, to change the industrial face of America. So the Russian bureaucrats turn from questions about their present barbarism and tell you how, in 1917, the liberating ideas of Marxism helped the people overthrow Tsarism and establish their own workers' state. But this is 1955, not 1917, and Russia now is the greatest tyranny on earth.

TWISTED TO FIT

Here, the American Government plays its two-faced role. Knowing that the American worker has no use whatever for Russian Communism, it pins that label on Marxism. But it is Marxism to which the workers are instinctively moving in fighting for new human relations with their fellow men, thus to establish a new society free from exploitation and war.

On the other side of the Atlantic, however, the State Department knows that the people of Western Europe and of the colonial world, totally reject capitalism and the two world wars it has brought them in a single lifetime. Accordingly, for overseas consumption, the State Department publishes pamphlets in which it claims that America is not "really" capitalistic any longer, but has gone "beyond capitalism." If anyone uttered such words here, they could easily land in jail.

In all this the American intellectuals, who are not on the Government payroll, are playing a sorry role indeed. Whether as paid or unpaid journalistic hacks, or as scholars issuing weighty tomes with hundreds of pages, called objective studies, they conspire to link the names of Karl Marx with the Communist totalitarian rulers. (For example, see Socialism In American Life, two volumes of 1931 pages, published in 1932 by Princeton University.)

It is this conspiracy which is keeping the name and doctrines of Karl Marx hidden from the American workers. That is why the audiences I am speaking to now are most incensed against the "underground ways" which keeps the knowledge of workers' struggles and workers' thinking for the past 200 years, stowed away where the people of today cannot see them.
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TENSIONS IN THE RUSSIAN ARMY

A colleague of mine has written the following:

The constant opposition of the so-called workers against
their rulers is to be found in the Russian Army as well.
(See TWO WORLDS, Sept. 21, 1955.)

THE PURGE BEGAN IN THE ARMY

Back in 1929, 26 and 27, when Stalin was maneuvering
for control and building his apparatus, he paid the
closest attention to his support in the Army. By 1927 in
particular, thousands of soldiers who had served during
the Revolution and the years immediately after were disarmed
and kicked out of the army. It was only after that, in
1928, that Stalin imposed his First Five Year Plan upon
Russia.

From this time on, the Russian rulers imposed a system-
matic brain-wash on their troops. Soldiers were bribed with
special allowances for themselves and their families as
against the rest of the workers in civilian life. At the same
time, they were held accountable for the loyalty of their
families (and vice-versa).

This preceded the expulsion of roughly one million
members, or one-third, of the Communist Party which,
in turn, preceded the first wave of open terror in 1934
and the first executions of Old Bolsheviks in 1933
- 1934.

OFFICERS VS. RANKS

Stalin's new Constitution of 1935, which gave official
recognition to the new bureaucracy of planners and admin-
istrators, also restored to the Army distinctions of rank
which had been abolished by the Revolution.

The differentiation between officers and men, between non-
coms and privates, was forcibly discouraged. Any non-com
or officer who failed to report the most minor violation was
immediately court-martialed. Secret police troops honey-
combing every company, so that even the most moderate
non-com and officer was ready to "throw the book" at the
soldiers in his command. Here is one example out of thou-
sands in that period: Five soldiers were sentenced to
years at hard labor for having left a rusty saw which was
worth about three rubles.

In 1937, having built his base so carefully for ten years,
Stalin completed his reorganization of the Army. He ex-
cuted the bulk of the High Command and promoted those
officers who had gone all the way with him.

THE BEGINNING OF WORLD WAR II

Nevertheless, when Russia invaded Poland in Septem-
ber 1939 and declared war on Finland two months later,
thousands of Russian soldiers deserted. Again the familiar
crack-down which can be measured by seemingly simple
regulations: by special decree, privates were compelled to
salute non-coms as well as officers under threat of court-
marital.

When Hitler invaded Russia, thousands and thousands
of Russian troops deserted to the enemy despite threats
from the rear and scores of battlefield executions. Hitler's
brutality, as much as anything else, discouraged mass
desertions after the first year.

As soon as the war was over, plans for reorganizing the
Army were put into effect at once. Veterans were demobi-
лизирован, quickly as possible and subjected to special
pressures at home. When the government cut the value of the ruble
shortly after the war, among the hardest hit were the veter-
ans.

Replacements for occupation duty were checked with
special vigilance. Non-coms and officers were hand-picked
and recruited were sent from the most remote agricultural
regions of Russia. Privatization of the people of occup-
ed countries is prohibited on pain of death.

With the beginning of the cold war in 1948, secret police
files swelled with reports of soldiers untrust. GI's were not
only criticising Army life, they were criticising such civilian
matters as transit-station administrators and factory man-
agers at home.

In 1959, those discharged from occupation service were
ordered back to their collectives when they had to
spend six months on probation before they could apply
for passes to look for work in the cities.

THE JUNE 17TH REVOLT

When the East Germans revolted against the Russians
on June 17, 1953, they rocked the Russian High Command.
Russian Commanders could not trust their soldiers to open
fire against the German workers. Small but significant
numbers actually mutinied and were executed. There was
a marked rise in the number of court-martials. At the same
time there was a steady stream of deserters to the West.

Since the June Days of 1953, entire units of Rus-
sian soldiers, discharged from occupation service, are
sent as "volunteers" under military command to forced
labor in the frozen agricultural regions Khrushchev is
now trying to put under cultivation.

Wednesday, October 26, 1955
TWO WORLDS

ATTITUDES TO AUTOMATION

The sharp division between the rank and file worker and the labor hierarchist is seen nowhere so clearly as in the different attitudes each has toward automation. Where the auto worker, for example, deals with it as it affects his daily life. Rather speaks of the future and "the promise" automation holds for a "vast improvement in living conditions" and "leisure."

AUTO WORKER

"I do not know what he is talking about," one woman worker told me, "I don't have any time to breathe, much less to loll about. The work week at Ford's now is 53 hours and here that man goes around talking about 'leisure.' As for working conditions, they are worse than they have ever been since the CIO first came into being. All automation has meant to us is unemployment and overwork, both at the same time."

MINER

I spoke to the miner who had written in to News & Letters about what the introduction of the continuous miner has meant to him—a loss of 30 pounds in weight caused by the speed-up and tension of automatic production. He added that that was only half of the story. The other half was safety—you just don't take out the time any more for the right underpinnings and there has been a serious rise in accidents.

The coal operators are trying to divide up the unit of the miners by making "maintenance men" part of management. What has happened with automation is this: The continuous miner needs the constant attention of men while it is in operation in order that the machine can be on the spot when the machine breaks down. The maintenance man thus assumes a very key position. He is generally younger, more skilled, better paid and outside of the direct production line. Management hopes thereby to use him to divide up the men in the mine.

Safety concern, however, brought the men together again. Because the continuous miner can work 24 hours a day, the foreman expected the men to proceed with the work although a death had just occurred in the particular mine. The men told the foreman in no uncertain terms that he could operate these machines if he was so concerned with production. They would go to the funeral. The maintenance man said he would go with the miners: "Human life is cheap enough around here."

YOUNG WORKER

A young worker in Los Angeles was most concerned with this question of human life and the fact that the human being in this day of automation is nothing but a "button, pusher." "Work would have to be something totally different," he continued, "What skill do you need? What pride can you have in your work if everything is done electronically and you are there—if you are lucky enough to get the job—just to blow the whistle when the machine breaks down. What about the human being?"

SKILLED WORKER

A skilled worker, on the other hand, could not see automation as a reality. "It seems there is very little automated industry outside of aircraft on the West Coast. Unlike mechanization, automation requires not only new machines but the product itself has to be completely redesigned. Naturally this requires not alone the introduction of new machines. You cannot just superimpose new controls on old assembly lines. Everything, including the end product, has to be newly conceived for mass production electronically controlled."

This worker pointed out all the machinery and factories that would have to be scrapped; that to be fully automated the investment in capital would need to be so immense because every fraction of a second would count up in the thousands of dollars in the question of production costs.

The whole question of obsolescence of machinery, caused and to be caused by automation is very crucial for this second industrial revolution. The mergers in the auto industry last year are but a slight indication of the strange mergers to come, now that electronics is in a controlling position over all industry. The whole pull is toward centralized control "in the hands of one single capitalist or one single corporation," as Marx put it some 83 years ago. We will return to this subject again.
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Friday, November 16, 1962
EUGENE VICTOR Debs: AMERICAN SOCIALIST

One hundred years ago Eugene Victor Debs, who was to become the greatest American socialist, was born in Terre Haute, Indiana. He became a socialist while he was in prison for having led the great Pullman strike in 1894. As Debs put it, it was the gleam of the bayonets of the Federal troops called out to put down the strike for elementary rights that transformed him from a union organizer into a socialist: "In the gleam of every bayonet and the flash of every rifle the class struggle was revealed, the capitalist class, the working class, the class struggle." The passionate belief in a new society free of all tyranny, capitalist exploitation and war, led him to expose the holocaust of the First World War. Once again he found himself in prison, this time for his anti-war views.

WENDELL PHILLIPS, ABOLITIONIST

Eugene Victor Debs was proud of the fact that when he was a young man he chaired a meeting for the Abolitionist leader Wendell Phillips. Debs was then secretary of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and in that capacity he invited the great orator of the Abolitionist movement to speak to his union. Phillips was then 70 years old, but still in the forefront of every social movement. Just as in the struggle to abolish slavery, he had felt that true freedom could be achieved in the South only if the freedmen were made the basis of a new South, so now he felt that only labor itself, white and black, could reconstruct society on totally new, truly human beginnings.

"We affirm as a fundamental principle," read Phillips' full body of faith, "that labor, the creator of wealth is entitled to all it creates.

"Afirming this, we ask ourselves willing to accept the final results of the operation of a principle so radical, such as the overthrow of the whole profit-making system, the extinction of all privileges, the abolition of privileged classes, universal education and fraternity, perfect freedom of exchange, and the final obliteration of all class distinctions, we ask ourselves the relationship between the revolts and movement of the slaves and the small group of talented journalists and speakers who headed the Abolitionist movement.

In its own organization the relationship of white to Negro was not what it was outside—the principle and need to abolish slavery. In its own organization that relationship of white to Negro became a relationship, a new relationship, between human beings. For the ex-slave often became a leader of the Abolitionist movement hereafter led by an idealistic white group of intellectuals. Frederick Douglass, Sojourner Truth, Harriet Tubman are but a few names of escaped slaves who became leaders. In truth, Abolitionism moved from a mere idea to an organization when the white intellectuals surrounded themselves with the bitterest militant ex-slaves.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF MEN TO WOMEN

A new relationship of men to women was first worked out in this movement to abolish slavery. From the first, women were active in the anti-slavery societies. The world anti-slavery movement forbade women's participation and the split of the movement. The American Abolitionists not only welcomed their participation but some of them, in turn, became involved in women's movement for their own rights. Frederick Douglass was among the first to come forward and champion the independent movement of women. It was he who chaired the first meeting of the Women's Suffrage Movement when the women still felt they needed a man to chair their meeting.

"Finally, take the question of a world outlook. William Lloyd Garrison, the founder and editor of the Liberator, from the first made the slogan of his paper, "Our country is the world—our countrymen are mankind."

PAST AND PRESENT

Thus every fundamental modern problem—relationship of white and Negro, new relations of men to women, the uniqueness and the deep-rootedness of the American problem and its world-wide connections—all these were first posed in America, on the eve of the Civil War...

For Wendell Phillips Abolitionism was the movement in his time for a new and free society. That is why socialism was for Eugene Victor Debs. Those who today praise Debs for his dedication and struggle in the past, actually besmirch him when they fail to see that the new society for which he fought is not past history but the future still striving to be born.
TWO WORLDS

THE GREAT DIVIDE BETWEEN THINKING & DOING

I have just completed a cross country tour during which I spoke to very different kinds of audiences:

One miner put it this way: "There is a time for praying. We do that on Sundays. There is a time for eating. We too eat matters in our hands during the Depression, building up our union and seeing that our families did not starve. There is a time for thinking. The time is now. What I want to know is: how and when will the working man—all working men—have such confidence in their own abilities to make a better world that they will not let others do their thinking for them."

That miner felt that the union wasn't much better than the company nowadays. The reason for this is that the rank and file had set "others"—the leadership—to their thinking and write their contracts for them. He pointed out that the change the worker had brought about through his activity had somehow turned into its opposite. The miners would elect some one to represent them in negotiations with management. Then the first thing anyone knew was that their representative became a labor bureaucrat who turned up in the District Office, not to fight with the workers against the company but to order the workers to produce more. This miner wanted to know: what made the miners stick together in 1913 and tell the senators that if they were so interested in production, they could dig the coal themselves, yet no one tells the same thing to the labor leadership today.

"The working man has a mind of his own," concluded the miner, "so why let them do his thinking for him?"

THE MOVEMENT FROM PRACTICE TO THEORY

I was thinking how far we had moved from the birth of modern socialism which had pronounced: "The philosophers have interpreted the world in various ways; the point, however, is to change it."

The miner said the change the workers brought about had "turned into its opposite." He wanted to make sure, before any more changes were brought about, that there be "no division between thinking and doing." He wanted to know how to bring about a unity of theory and practice from the start.

Naturally I had no answer, ready-made or otherwise. I did tell him that his very desire for a total solution contains the answer. It was a sign of the maturity of the age that he was dissatisfied with piecemeal answers, whether those concern the pay check or the union organization.

The very fact that there was this movement from prac-

lice to theory imparted an urgency to a new unity of theory and practice. I had only one historical example to point to show that the movement from theory to practice had also dealt with this problem. It was what Lenin did at the outbreak of the first World War. I called it the great divide in Marxism.

THE GREAT DIVIDE IN MARXISM

The holocaust of the first World War had shattered everything, including the very working class organization which was built up to oppose the imperialist war. The name of the organization was the Second International and, though it was millions strong, it folded like a house of cards. Its leadership was Marxist and that was supposed to stand for the unity of the world working class, but each of the national organizations voted to send armies to shoot the other. Thus, the greatest of the parties, The German Social Democracy, voted war credits to the Kaiser and forgot all it taught others about class solidarity.

This transformation of a Marxist organization into its opposite was a much greater shock to Lenin than the fact that, say, the elected representatives of the miners turned into labor bureaucrats. It was not enough to say the Second International betrayed Marxism. As Lenin put it later: "No one has yet invented a "sincerometer" to measure one's sincerity. The matter had to be proved objectively, in real life. Lenin began by examining what in his own way of thinking had blinded him to the inevitable betrayal. For that he went back to study the philosophical foundations of Marxism.

Although, since then, the first workers state has, in turn, become transformed into the greatest tyranny on earth, I concluded, we have a lot to learn from the way Lenin met the crisis of his time in the Philosophic Notebooks.

LENIN'S PHILOSOPHIC NOTEBOOKS

NEWS & LETTERS has had transcribed and mimeographed the most important extracts from his Notebooks. (See ad on page 1.) I want to urge everyone of our readers to grapple with them. It is not that there is in them any ready-made answers to the problems of the day. Just as there is no assured success to practice, so there is no royal road to knowledge. Nothing is ever gained by man except through labor and struggle and patience. For him who has that patience and grapples with these Notebooks, all sorts of new vistas will unfold.
TWO WORLDS
TOWARDS A NEW UNITY OF THEORY AND PRACTICE

In the last issue I spoke of the miner who wanted to see this society changed. You feared that it might once again "turn into its opposite." He had seen too many things "turn into their opposite," such as the labor representatives into labor bureaucrats—in small porkchoppers like the District men to large ones like the Washington men. He felt that only some new unity of theory and practice, unified in the worker himself, would assure the creation of a really new society. The question was: when would the worker gain confidence in his own abilities to stop letting "others" do his thinking for him; and how can the division between thinking and doing stop.

SEARCHING FOR A TOTAL VIEW

This worker was searching for a new philosophy, a total view. I had told him about the great divide in Marxism that had occurred after the outbreak of World War I when official Marxism—a movement of liberation—had changed into its opposite and supported the imperialist war.

It was this which had compelled Lenin to examine the philosophical foundations of Marxism. I asked our readers to study Lenin's Philosophical Notes, extracts of which had just been published by NEWS & LETTERS. (See ad on p. 1)

LENI N CONDEMN S "COMMUNIES"

I now wish to deal with Lenin's Will, written 33 years ago this month. In the Philosophical Notes, Lenin was preoccupied with how the old Marxists, known as the Second Internatio nal, had come to betray the working class. In the Will he was concerned with his own colleagues, leaders of the Bolshevik revolution in Russia in November 1917, who had themselves given birth to a new bureaucracy. There was no more severe critic of the new workers state than this great leader of the revolution. He invented new words to describe what had happened to the Communist Party now that it held power. He said they had all become vain and that all around were heard "communilies" (Communist lies). He warned that if they did not change drastically, Russia would end up being another kind of capitalism—state capitalism—instead of a socialist society.

BEHIND THE FIGHT BETWEEN STALIN & TROTSKY

These words, spoken in March 1922, to the last Congress of the Russian Communist Party which he attended, were not heeded by his co-leaders. A faction fight broke out between Stalin and Trotsky. Lenin searched for the meaning of that fight and it was under this circumstance that he began his Will in December 1922 and completed it in January 1923.

There is no more amazing document in the annals of politics than this brief, two-page Will. It deals in the concrete with the leaders of the Russian Communist Party in a manner which leaves no division between politics and economy, history and philosophy, theory and practice, revolution and counter-revolution.

Lenin states boldly that, if the dual nature of the Russian state—that of being a state of workers and peasants—is at the root of the dispute between the principal combatants—Trotsky and Stalin—then no force on earth could stop the class division from bringing down the workers state. Its fall is inevitable. However, the trends implicit in the dispute are not yet a reality. With that in mind, says Lenin, let's take a look at the general staff which made the revolution:

1) Stalin. He is "rude and dishonest." That is to say, we have in this social personality the ruthlessness of the outright counter-revolution. He must be removed, says Lenin.

2) Trotsky, his "non-Bolshevik," writes Lenin, does not in any way from the fact that he is "the most able man in the present Central Committee," but he is "far too much attracted by the purely administrative side of affairs." (My emphasis.) In other words, there is here the inner danger in the establishment of planning over the workers.

3) Zinoviev and Kamenev. They published the date of revolution in the capitalist papers, at the very moment when the workers were trying to take power. This was "no accident," Lenin reminds us. That is to say, at every critical moment, they can be expected to do the same.
Yet they all were revolutionaries, revolutionary leaders who, when the energies of million-headed masses smashed
the old and created the new, could and did make great
contributions to the greatest single fact of world history:
the creation of the workers' state.
BUKHARIN AND MARXIAN PHILOSOPHY

What stands out in the rest of the Will is that it was
not alone the elder men who would look for administrative,
instead of human, solutions to complex problems, but the
younger men. Tade Bukharin:

4) "Bukharin is not only the most valuable and big-
gest theoretician of the party, but also may legitimately
be considered the favorite of the whole party; but his
theoretical views can only with the very greatest doubt
be regarded as fully Marxist, for there is something schol-
lastic in him (he never learned, and I think never fully
understood the dialectic)."

Note that, so far as Lenin is concerned, if you
have never understood "the dialectic," or Marxist
philosophy, you cannot be regarded as a Marxist,
though you be "the biggest theoretician of the party."

Therefore no one has paid attention to this analysis
of Bukharin. Therefore, the preoccupation was not with
more theoreticians, but with men of power: Stalin and
Trotsky.

LENIN'S WILL SUPPRESSED

For from removing Stalin, the Russian leadership sup-
pressed Lenin's Will. When Stalin consolidated his power
and exiled Trotsky, Trotsky published the Will. But, again,
the emphasis was Stalin and Trotsky.

It is impossible to arrive at any other conclusion
than the fact that even Lenin's closest colleagues had been
treating his philosophic concepts as the Marxists before
World War I had treated Marxian philosophy—as some
accidental 19th century addition to "great economic theo-
rism."

Nothing could be further from the truth. Without the
new humanism of Marx and later of Lenin, the economic
theories of both would be meaningless.

Lenin is remaining as, in his Will, a lifetime spent in
the revolutionary movement and six years as head of the
workers' state. He is saying that only when leaders are
closely connected with the working class are they great.

But it is the masses, and only they, that must
destroy the old and create the new, while the leaders,
be they the greatest of theoreticians and believers in
all, can go astray if they fail to respond to the experi-
tion of the masses of people at every stage.

A NEW HUMANISM OR SOCIALISM

CAPITALIST BARBARISM

Worse yet, leaders are not human creatures, dealing
between heaven and earth. They are very much earthy men.
When they lose close connection with the working class,
they begin to represent the only other fundamental class
in society—the capitalist class.

What was not yet a reality when Lenin wrote this,
became a reality very soon when Stalin consolidated his
power and introduced the Plun. It is true that even Lenin
did not see Stalin as representing an alien class. But he
was prophetic in this: He stated that if the differences
within the leadership did reflect outright class differences
then nothing could save the workers' state. Nothing. Noth-
ing will. It becomes transformed into a State Capitalist
society.

Now that we are confronted with the reality of Russia
as the barbarian that it is, the workers have a right to
demand, as the miner did, nothing less than a total outlook:
nothing short of the unity of theory and practice within
the worker himself.
TWO WORLDS

A LITTLE BIT MAD

I received a letter from a new subscriber named Bea. Bea told me that a neighbor of hers, whom I shall call Rita, had suddenly become "a little bit mad." She explained that she was writing to me about it because it was evidently induced by her friend's shock that she, Bea, had subscribed to Nees & Letters.

It seems that Rita had been a radical once but had never admitted it. But then one day, after many weeks, she came to visit and saw Bea reading the paper. There and then she became "a little bit mad," suddenly calling Bea "stupid" for not recognizing that the paper was "old stuff, old, radical stuff" and for not realizing that she was "being taken."

The torrent of words was abusive enough against "the leadership." However, it didn't go on to anything concrete that Bea could bite into and she didn't know where it was that she was "being taken."

"NEW" PROGRAMS WITH OLD CONCLUSIONS

Bea's letter goes on to say that her husband had told her about a certain type who is well-known, in the factory, to everyone who has ever been able to attend a trade union meeting. There is always the busybody, the excess builder, the one with an elaborate "new" program that has but one old conclusion: Vote for me. When and if you do — and I do want to impress upon you the fact that it is not only that different from all other bureaus, he is positively faceless.

"But," Bea concludes, "I never thought our little back fence chair also contained that type. Where exactly would Rita want to lead me as opposed to where you are leading?" She doesn't belong to anything that I know about. It is true she talks a lot about 'politeness' and she so often hears us there is no one, but if she can in any popularity contest, she certainly wouldn't win in her own neighborhood. The main reason I am writing this to you is that perhaps you can tell me something about the why or her bitterness and why it is that she thinks that everything in your paper is 'old' but everything she says is 'new'."

THE BITTER EX-RADICAL

Now I don't know Rita so I cannot tell Bea anything about her as an individual, whether faceless or with a personality. But as a social type, I can truthfully say that Bea's idea of the labor movement more familiar than the ex-radical. The population as a whole seems more familiar with the ex-radical who lives in a pigpen, than with the one who is a turncoat; who can, in fact, not part with some of the ideas of the labor movement. He will even go to a meeting of the group he once belonged to, as a way of self-expression, to show his "independence." And to pay upon any newcomer who may not yet have found himself at home in the gulf that seems to separate the perspectives of a new society from the routine of running a meeting.

The total situation of the world crisis is such that the ex-radical cannot accept the world as it is. But he knows not how the new one will emerge. As a result, he is as funny as a grasshopper. Even his smile distinguishes him from the ordinary citizens of his community: It is the unhappiest in the world as if a bludgeon rather than a human impetus parted those lips.

I know of one such who did not even attend meetings. He expended all his enormous energies in letter writing. He invariably begins with great indignation at the stupidities of the ordinary mortal, or the magazine, or whatever it was he was addressing. At the end he is, usually if not modestly, that he was writing on the one subject he knows well, but even if it were something he knows nothing about, etc., etc.

His open admission that he knows nothing about some subject is well-oped hypocrisy to show that even if he knows nothing and the one he addresses knows everything, he is still the superior man.

"THE FRENZY OF SELF-CONCEIT"

The great German philosopher, Hegel, analyzed the development of this type through the ages and periods of historic development. Types such as Rita, develop from being "an alienated soul," that is, unable to find themselves in the new world, to where the madness between the real and the natural, send them into a frenzy of self-conceit.

"The heart-throb for the welfare of mankind passes therefore into the rage of fantastic self-conceit, into the fury of consciousness to preserve itself from destruction."

Yet these people exert a vampire-like grip on the few who associate with them and put up with their "self-willed impotence," which they hide in "a godly whirl of self-perpetuating disorder."

Hegel called this type "the alienated type of mind," who, because he has nothing positive to give, produces a spiritual reign of terror bent as it is in a rage and fury of destruction."

If dishes didn't fly into Bea's house, what she refused to cancel her subscription, then Rita has not yet given the "full treatment."
TWO WORLDS

THE FRENZY OF SELF-CONCEPT

A colleague of mine has written the following:

"You wrote recently ('Two Worlds,' Jan. 31) about the ex-radical who wanders through the world screaming at everything. In a 'frenzy of self-concept' he cannot accept the world as it is, but he knows not how a new one will emerge. Above all, he scorns any serious attempt to understand the conflicts and contradictions in this cold-war world, while at the same time he has nothing but contempt for the common man's instincts for a better world.

"There are people I know who fit this bill to a "T." They grew up during the dark days of the Depression and, during the 1940's, were full of 'the heart-throb for the welfare of mankind.'"

FROM 'HEART THROB' TO CONTTEMPT

"Today, they are between 35 and 45. Very sentimental about the idealism of their youth, they are equally positive that it was unrealistic because it glorified the worker who isn't interested in anything but his belly.

"One of these men told me he was working up a catalogue of all different kinds of tensions which can arise: from racial tensions in a mixed neighborhood to strike feuds in an industrial community.

"His job was to break down the most complicated situations into the way any given individual is affected. For example, how it affects a prejudiced white or an angry Negro; a Jew or an anti-Semitic; a young worker or a middle-aged housewife; a storekeeper or a cop on strike duty, and so on.

DEGRADING MAN TO A COG IN A MACHINE

"Since we know from psychology," he went on, "how to solve the individual's problems, if we analyze the tensions on an individual basis, we can work out the solutions. By organizing these simple solutions or punch cards, where community tension arises we can feed the problem into the machine and come out with the correct answers to restore harmony.

"He said, "It's harsh but it's true and as a scientist I have to deal with truth. That old stuff we used to talk about the common man changing the world, was just sentimental childishness. The masses never changed anything. A few of us can do more good than 20 million workers."

IDEALISM OF YOUTH

"Another one is a professor in a large university and his specialty is 'city planning.' He told me angrily that the 'old stuff about the common man' was a lie when we were young. But he's glad that he was part of the movement of the 30's because all young people need the exaltation of idealism, which has no place in the adult world no matter how much he, personally, misses it.

THE TOP SERGEANTS OF LABOR

"A third, who holds a post in one of the large international unions, assured me that labor relations are so complicated that it takes special training to conduct successful negotiations and that untrained rank-and-filers would only foul things up.

"A fourth is now a business man. Until five years ago he was a UAW committee man. He said neither had grown 'too big' and had moved too far away from the line. He also said he never let any of his men on the line force him to process 'unjustified grievances.'

"Like' top sergeants many of us have known, the only one he hated worse than the captain was the enlisted man.

"I could go on for 30 pages describing such people that I have known and still meet. One thing identifies them all: they were heartbreak boys during the Depression who suddenly found a goal and a purpose in the unemployed movement and the tremendous all-down strikes that marked the rise of the CIO.

"The rising labor bureaucracy, working hard in hand with the New Deal, suddenly created openings for them. By one road or another, (some actually went to work in the factory for a few years) they made their way to jobs in the unions and out, as educational directors, public relations consultants, labor relations men, advisors, consultants and analysts of all kinds. That's all their 'radicalism' turned out to mean.

"Twenty years ago they knew that capitalism was choking the world. Today, by word or deed they're all for 'people's capitalism' which is the State Department's line about what we have in America.

"If they were on the other side of the Iron Curtain they'd be just as strong for Russia's 'people's democracy.' Caught in between, they'll be for some kind of popular front between 'people's capitalism' and 'people's democracy.'

OLD STUFF

"If they believed what they said 30 years ago, they don't believe a word of what they say today. The one thing they won't do is to keep quiet. They've got to give you their 'honest opinion' which always boils down to this: Everyday men and women, especially the workers, are dumb. The common man has never done anything and can't do anything.
TWO WORLDS

WITHOUT A PAST AND WITHOUT A FUTURE

The 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, which met on February 15, 1956, in Moscow, was the first to be convened since Stalin's death in 1953. It wanted no time in launching a campaign against him. The First Deputy Premier, Anatolii Mikoyan, prefatory, dismissed the heretofore sacred Stalin-History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and noted, "How can you justify our lack of an accepted history of the party for two decades?"

A TRAGIC PARABLE

"To the Russians are rewriting history yet once again," I heard one Russian specialist say, "I understand that they now publish their Encyclopaedia in looseleaf form."

These vainglorious bureaucrats, without a past, and without a future, rule over a land of 200 million, armed with the H-bomb and are reaching out for world domination. Let us see: 25-25 is now and what is old in their latest rewrite of history. The last two decades evidently need "correction." Mikoyan specifies the period to go back "about 20 years."

"ABOUT 20 YEARS"

Lenin died not "about 20 years" ago, but 22 years ago. He left a Will in which he called Stalin "rude and disloyal" and asked that he be removed from his post of General Secretary.

Instead of removing Stalin, the present leadership collaborated in hiding the Will, which to this day has never been published in Russia. To talk only of "about 20 years" means the bureaucracy is anxious somehow to skip a decade. It is the decade in which they helped Stalin not abuse to maintain his post, but to transform it into one of dictatorial power.

Above that struggle for power that followed Lenin's death, was the struggle against the newly-established workers state itself. Indeed, the struggle for power among the bureaucracy was only the reflection of the counter-revolution that took from the Russian workers their rights and freedom, instituted bureaucratic planning, in a word, established a relationship between work and management that is no essential respect differs from that in Western countries.

"About 20 years" correctly sums up the basis on which they mean to begin their rewrite. No one who had not participated in the counter-revolution, following the death of Lenin, is included. Trotsky is therefore excluded. Indeed, their present establishment of "collective leadership" is only a farcial imitation of Stalin's struggle for power against Trotsky on the basis of a collective leadership against alleged one-man rule. Not only that, with the sole exception of Tito, there is not a living person whom they are "rehabilitating." Not only are those to be "rehabilitated" dead, they are those who, in the first place, made their peace with Stalinism. As for Tito, he has power in his own right, rules over a country which is strategically placed, is storing with "the West" and the Russian bureaucracy needs him. He is of the same cloth as they.

WHEN TO STRUGGLE FOR WORLD DOMINATION

As we can see, the truth is that the entire "collective leadership" lives by virtue of Stalin's leadership which brought them to power.

It is the only foundation for all exploitation. The rulers continue to sit in the scale of power and rule, while the workers continue to slave the harder and produce the more.

This does not mean that there have been no changes initiated at this congress. Tito is one of those changes. Stalin had, in fact, lost power long before he died. Not that any one dared challenge him. But he ceased to represent the bureaucracy which wanted a breathing spell between wars, while he was so drunk with power that he was, a mad rush for world domination the day after World War II concluded. The bureaucracy that dared not challenge his rule openly, "collectively" plotted to hasten his natural death. He no sooner was dead than the internal war came to a conclusion, on the one hand, and some internal changes occurred within Russia.

Although they "collectively" agreed that Stalin was in their way when he was alive, Stalin was no sooner dead than a new struggle for power began. But by now the regime is too emboldened to dare public trials. Thus the "collectivity" of leadership, is the reason why Molotov was not "liquidated" when he left out to Khru- schev.

Greater and more terrifying than the "myth of Stalin" in the present identification of revolutions with counter-revolutions under the gigantic fraud of an alleged return to Leninism. The only way the present "collective leadership" could follow out the Leninist principle is to remove themselves from power.

If Khru shchev, the heir, is not all that Stalin was, his ambitions and appetites are just as insatiable. It was merely a question of when to fight for world power. History, however, will not give the new pretenders to world rule another period of "about 20 years."
AFTER THE 20TH CONGRESS OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

Where Is Russia Going?

Since the recent 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, the capitalist press and spokesmen of the West have been so busy publicizing what the Russian Communists wanted publicized—the destruction of the so-called Stalin myth—that they failed completely to see what is new in the present Russian situation.

The Russian people never believed in the Stalin myth in the first place, or in “the cult of personality,” as the present Russian rulers call it.

The millions in forced labor camps testify to more than mere disbel

The imprisoned millions are proof of the continuous revolt of the Russian people against the tyrant, Stalin, and against his heirs who are now his de

Contrast the big noise in the press, about the Stalin myth, to the matter-of-fact knowledge of the Russian peasant who, when asked by reporters for the name of his collective farm, answered, “Up to now it was called the Stalin Collective.”

THE AGRICULTURAL CRISIS

To the Russian peasant it matters little whether it was Stalin or Khruschev, or whether it is Khruschev alone or Khruschev plus a dozen other bureaucrats who rule “collectively.” What does matter—and what is new—is that the new five-year plan demands nothing less than 100 per cent increase in agricultural productivity per person.

Since the Russian peasants have resisted the rate of output set by all previous plans and intends to continue his resistance to totalitarian planning, this new, impossible demand can have but one meaning:

A new move against him that will be more ferocious and more charged with terror than even the forced collectivization of the 1930’s.

In the depth of the internal crisis of Russia, can be seen the reality and nonreality of the “collectivity” of the Russian leaders. Khruschev, the leader, dares not openly stand forth as such. He tries to cover himself against the wrath of the Russian people, first by attempting to divert their anger to the dead Stalin and then, by surrounding himself with the collective approval of the leadership. He does not, for one moment, fool himself about any approval by the Russian people.

WORLD CRISIS AND COLONIAL REVOLTS

What does give Khruschev his confidence is the world crisis. The Russian masses know the Communist system for the tyranny it is. So does Eastern Europe that has fallen under its domination. But the gigantic Communist bureaucracy has no vested interests in the countries suffering under British and French imperialism. The Asian and African people have also come to know what is glibly called “the American dollar.” It is this which gives Khruschev a free hand in demagoguery.

He hopes to reap a rich harvest from the hatred of the colonial peoples and to parate under the smudged banner of liberation of Marseilles.

To counter this, the American Government can think of nothing better than a puppet for their “brink of war” strategists. Dulles, to be followed by that spokesman for “people’s capitalism,” Labor Premier Walter Reuther. But Reuther is no match for the Russian appeal for a “popular front” for peace which will travel from Nehru’s India to Western Europe and back again, not excluding America.

The majority of the world’s people live in the oppressed colonial portion of the earth. The Russian bureaucracy has shown how brave they can be with other people’s lives, as they were with the lives of the Chinese and Koreans during the Korean war.

Khruschev can now dream of starting the next world war from the East and enjoying the luxury,
which America has always enjoyed hitherto, of never having the battle fields in his own country.

At the same time, Russian power has grown mighty enough so that its Defense Minister, Zhukov, can threaten America with the "mighty invaders" he has at the disposal and can hurl at American cities.

INTERNAL CRISIS IN RUSSIA

If the American capital-
ists strike, the Russian rulers have a ready-made hand. The Russian workers do not.

1) Out of 12 million industrial workers in Russian enterprises, no fewer than 2.5 million left their jobs in 1934.

2) 1.45 million workers in the building industries simply left the building sites altogether. In an attempt to counteract this movement, Molotov proposed to permanentize building trades workers that ten per cent of all the living space they construct would be for their own use.

The Russian worker cannot strike, but he has managed to resist the labor bureaucracy's demands for continuous and heightened production by labor turnover and slow down on the job.

RESISTANCE OF LABOR

The Russian bureaucracy is now breaking their backs on how to solve the problem of the resistance of labor and the shortage of labor. Just as, at the end of World War II, the Russian rulers had to grant a general amnesty for all labor offenses, to gain some kind of labor force, now, they have to gain some more production from labor by promising a shorter working day.

The Russian workers have just been promised a 3-hour workday, today week. First of all, this promise doesn't give the Russian worker something new: a 3-hour workday before the war which was never restored to him when the war was over. Secondly, the "new" 42-hour week is not promised as of now, but, presumably, by 1930 when this novel plan is put into effect—the sixth Five Year Plan ends. For now, all the Russian worker got was a reduction of two hours a week. Instead of 18 hours, they now work only 16 hours.

The joke is in the decree which announced this "new", reduced workweek without pay cut. The decree also states: "Managers are instructed to see to the carrying out of the decree and are also responsible for the unconditional fulfillment of the set assignments for the volume of production."

In a word, the Russian workers are required to produce as much in 40 hours as they did in 48 hours.

That is the favorite underhand trick of wage-cutting in Russia. They don't ever announce a wage cut, but they constantly revise the production norms, always upward. The latest Plan calls for a 20 per cent increase in labor productivity.

TECHNOLOGY AND MODERN TECHNOLOGY

The bureaucracy hopes to overcome the workers' resistance by automation. No private property capitalist has ever dreamt of more fantastic dreams of push-button factories without workers, than the present dreams of the Russian state capitalists.

Bukharin laid the basis last summer, when he told the plenary session that "some economic managers have lost their feeling for the new... Great harm is caused to technical progress in our country by underestimating the achievements of technology already... The main thing is not to discover first but to introduce first... Industry must be redesigned to provide proper incentive to technical innovation."

DECENTRALIZING PLANNING

Some Western writers have been completely confused by the new stress the Russian rulers have put on "decentralizing planning." Like Ford's present "decentralization plan," it is not to give the worker any voice in production—but to give the director, that is, the manufacturer, a freer hand and more power over the workers as to hiring and firing and intimidation to extract more production.

The increase in managerial powers is to be backed up by an increase in the percentages of profits that is at the disposal of the factory director, it was between 15 to 40 per cent. It is now to be no less than 50 per cent and as high as 70 per cent.

The totalitarian rulers place no reliance in the Russian working people. "Specialists," said Premier Bulganin, are our gold reserves. We are proud of them and we value them. This privileged intelligentsia—the engineers, technicians and speed-demons, whom they call "inventors"—are to be armed with even higher wages than they already receive, which is not less than 20 times more than the average worker gets.

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE MINDS OF MEN

The Russian tyranny is the exact opposite. In theory and in practice, the theory of liberation of Marxism-Leninism. In its gigantic effort to force an identity between the two opposites—Marxism and Russian Communism—it gets its greatest help from the American Administration.

The struggle for the minds of men cannot be won under the banner of "free enterprise." Resting talk about "American democracy" will not do. The majority of the world's population is colored and none is as backward as Rosenbercr or Stevenson that he does not know the truth of the situation in the South, which shows, when concentrated from the situation in the North...

Russia is waging battles without fighting only because it can pretend to march under the banner of freedom. There is no way to "expose" that except through...
an appeal to—and the realization of—actual freedom.
The only thing that will stay the
trend of Russian state
capitalism, reaching out for
world domination, is the Rus-
sian working class in alliance
with the working people of
the world.
American capitalism hopes
to use the American work-
ers' detestation of Russian
Communism, in order to keep
them from going to Marxism.
Their hope is in vain. Marx-
ism is not in Russia. It is
in the daily life of people
the world over, striving to
break out of the chain of
capitalism and war to a new
society.
The only thing that Am-

erian capitalism will have
achieved is its attempted
identification of Marxism
with Communism. It has
identified itself with Communism
as the other pole of world
capital striving for world
power.
TWO WORLDS

THREE DATEDLINES

Three events have just taken place which emphasize the gulf between rank and file people, on the one hand, and the labor and government bureaucrats, on the other. The first event was a meeting in Montgomery, Alabama, where the Negro people decided they will never again ride the buses on a segregated basis. The second event was a UAW conference in Washington, D.C., which showed that the labor bureaucracy can play the game of politics as well as the Democrat and Republican politicians.

The third was a meeting at the summit—and the summits are so far away from the people it is hard even to remember that it is all taking place on the same planet. The new “summit” meeting happened in England, which played host to those same totalitarian Khrouchev and Bulganin. During Geneva, peace was on everybody’s lips while the most devastating preparations for war went on at full speed.

THE BIGGEST LIE OF ALL

The Communist Party frontiers, including the so-called left of the British Labor Party, as well as American liberals (not excluding Alger Hiss) all chorused: “Peace is more possible now than at any time in history.”

To “prove” their grand illusion they say that never have weapons been more terrifying. As if that had ever stopped a war! To be more terrifying, the greater the scope of war from national to international dimensions.

There is in fact no greater lie than this peace “theory”. It is on a par with mouthing phrases about peace while dropping the atomic bomb in Hiroshima.

The hypocrisy of the labor bureaucracy is in a par with the government bureaucrats, whether on the international or national scene. In the present conference of the UAW it was a case of double self-exposure.

Being out of power, Democratic hopeful, Stevenson, had nothing to lose when he slammed before the UAW bureaucrats the possibility of a cabinet post: “Who,” he asked, “from organized labor would come to this cabinet meeting now?” There were sitting at the cabinet table three men from one corporation—and no one from the 10 million membership of the AFL-CIO.

While Stevenson was bargaining for the labor vote, Reuther bargained for the Negro vote. “You cannot have labor and Eastland in the same party,” he shouted.

When he plays politics, he counts the millions of organized labor as if he had their vote in his hip pocket, but when he himself gets to do anything for the cause of equality, all he can do is shout into the microphone. It is purely, indeed. A typical example of that is the manner in which UAW Local 600 tried to get Rosa Parks who per- ceptually initiated the Montgomery boycott.

Here is the largest union local in the world, numbering some 60,000. The leadership invites Rosa Parks to address the local but keeps it so deep a secret that only 200 show up at the meeting. The rest of the UAW mem- bers first heard about it when most of us first heard it afters the event when it was reported in the regular daily press.

How could Mrs. Parks have concluded anything that just an expression means a white face down South, hypocrisy does up North?

THE GREATEST THING OF ALL:

SPONTANEOUS ORGANIZATION

In contrast to the hypocrisy of the labor bureaucracy and the big lie of the “peace meetings” at the summit, there was the forceful voice of the Alabama Negroes who have taken the matter of their freedom into their own hands and have never let go in all these months.

Because the spontaneity of the walkout and the organiza- tion of their forces to keep up the boycott was simultane- ous action, it is here that we can see what is truly historic and contains our future. Just watch how they have never let anything slip out of their hands since the boycott was started:

1) They have been in continuous session; daily there are small meetings; three times weekly, mass meetings at all times, the new relationships.

2) The decision is always their own. When the Supreme Court handed down its decision against segregated buses and the bus company, hungry for their profits, hung up notices they would obey decisions, the Negroes said: We also asked for Negro bus drivers. To the city fathers who proclaim segregation as the “Southern way of life,” they, as Southerners, said that if they never ride the buses, it will be soon enough.

3) The organization of their own transportation, with- out either boss or political supervision, is a model.

Clearly, the greatest thing of all in this Montgom- ery spontaneous organization is its own working existence. It should serve as a living lesson to the many who see strikes, revolts and struggles but fail to see a new society emerging out of those struggles.
A SECOND LOOK AT KHRushCHEV

It is time to stop repeating trite lines about Russia.

Of course nothing essential has changed since the death of Stalin. The only thing that distinguished that regime of state capitalism—which calls itself communism—from private capitalism—which the Western labor bureaucracy likes to call "people's capitalism"—is that in the first case the exploiter in the factory is the forced labor camps.

Of course Nikolai Khruoshev, the First Secretary of the Russian Communist Party, who dramatically discarded the Stalin myth, continues to bear astonishing resemblance to Stalin.

The point is: why did he blow up the Stalin myth; and why does he rule Stalin's totalitarian party, not in Stalin's name, but by defiling him?

THE INTERNAL REASONS

It is easy to see why he did so for external reasons.

It is not easy to see what were the internal reasons which compelled the change. It certainly wasn't any illusion that he could pass his tyranny off, as Marxian freedom, to people who live under his totalitarianism.

At the time of Stalin's death I wrote that no tyrant had left his fighting heirs a more pathetic last testament than did Stalin with his "Economic Problems of Socialism."

STILL "IN THE NAME OF STALIN"

This is where Khruoshev came in. He never wanted to be saddled with this last testament of Stalin. He thought he could shemanscape that vision, precisely in his special field—agriculture—by moving away from the total concentration on heavy industry. Instead he looked to plowing up virgin territories in Siberia and creating agrocenters (agricultural cities), not by the peasants but by turning city youth into farmers. At least he sent them by the thousands into that wilderness hoping that their "eagerness and dynamism and dedication as of old"—purposely suffering they would not take. But if Khruoshev could, "in the name of Marxism-Leninism," create that vision, then the sufficed party that Stalin left might yet be recharged and made ready for world conquest. The point was to get undisputed control of the Party leadership in order to embark on this social scheme.

MOVING IN FOR THE KILL

During Malenkov's brief reign of power, the attempt was made to rechurge the "atmosphere"—that is, to say, overcome the crisis undermining the regime—by embarking on a spurt of agricultural production of consumer goods. That failed. Then Khruoshev moved in for the kill.

Just as Stalin, once he crushed all opposition, came out as theorician "in the name of Marxism-Leninism," so Khruoshev, now that he had Malenkov demoted, moved in his own name. Where, before, he was scuttling some of Stalin's last policies "in the name of Stalin," he now decided to move head on against the status quo in agriculture which was in the greatest crisis.

He refurbished his 1950 scheme. Only now he sent 150,000 youth into the Siberian wastelands. In Russia the youth are in State Labor Reserves and must go wherever they are ordered.

Khruoshev then came out openly against Stalin, the tyrant, who had ousted the Party leadership and made them incapable of moving forward. With him he had the army, which had long suffered from Stalin's military strategy. He had no further need of Stalin's ghost to rechurge his bureaucratic colleagues. The last service that Stalin could do was to be the scapegoat—provide a reasonable explanation for the sufferings of the Russian people and for the bureaucratic regime's unpreparedness to meet the Nazi attack.

Khruoshev now could move for the final revision of party history.

Where it took Stalin more than ten years to consolidate his power, Khruoshev could do it in two short years because no clear issues were involved. The counter-revolution, which transformed the early workers' state into the greatest tyranny on earth, had already been accomplished by Stalin.

The more total the perversion of Marxism of Marxism-Leninism, that ideology of liberation, however, means something totally different to the Russian people. Under its banner they overthrow the corrupt anticlerical Tsarist regime. They will do as thorough a job on the present totalitarian rulers.
TWO WORLDS

NEGRO STRUGGLES LABOR BUREAUCRACY

Two kinds of politics face each other down South. One is in the voting booth which has legally perpetuated the White Supremacy South. The other is in the living, thinking, acting determination of Negroes for full human rights. Despite all the power of the state and the economy and the artificially inflamed prejudices, the Negro has continued his struggle for freedom up to this point. It has thrown fear into the reactionaries. The voting-booth politics have been backed up by the open counter-revolution in the streets—both in the form of the Ku Klux Klan and its new "more respectable" face of the White Citizens Council.

THE INDEPENDENT NEGRO STRUGGLE

The independent struggle of the Negro people has never been in the voting booth which is exclusively white.

In the South, it has always been the politics of voting but not of doing. The superiority of the Negro struggle lies in this: their deeds open all the elements of a new society, a new way of life.

By their bus boycotts, they have made history; by their strikes; by their unorganized way of self-activity which, as a people, rose to full dignity; and their ability to run their own lives.

TWO FRONT

At the moment, the war in the South is proceeding along two fronts: 1) the bus boycott; and 2) school integration.

The Deep South remains solidly anti-Supreme Court, to the point of voting to transform public schools into private schools to maintain segregation. At the moment, it seems not to face the battle of the streets on school integration. There, nevertheless, is where the battle will be decisive. The battle has just begun.

It is to be noted that precisely in the deep South—Montgomery, Alabama; Tallahassee, Florida—the Negro has displayed the greatest talents and determination to stop his march to freedom. "Enslaved" knows that except the labor bureaucracy, the self-styled "friend of the Negro."

FROM BOTH SIDES OF THE MOUTH

The labor bureaucracy is busy talking out of both sides of its mouth.

Before the convention of the Democratic Party, Walter Reuther was busy saying: "You cannot have Labor and the East Germans in one party."

At the convention, he swallowed his tongue—even to the point of not fighting for the mere mention of the "revolutionary" Supreme Court Decision.

Now that the South is satisfied not to repeat its walk-out of 1948 and 1952, he is busy saying once again that Republicanism means "depression". Therefore, he counsels, the Negro better forget his struggles and line up with labor—in the Democratic Party!

This self-appointed messenger boy for that strange capitalist party fears touching the race question, although it is precisely that which has kept the South incorrigible.

Politicking to keep labor and the Negro tied to the capitalist machine, Reuther also fears fighting automation as the worker fights it. To him, unemployment is the necessary price for "progress." He never once asks, much less answers: Whose progress?

THE OPEN TAKING OF SIDES

This is news to no one, of course. It is stated here only in order to contrast it with the very open taking of sides by the "cultured South."

Thus, it is not only the monstrous face of the Ku Klux Klan, or of Governor Talasey, or of the White Citizens Councils that wants the South as it is: "Cultured Southerner" Faulkner is ready to spill Negro blood to maintain that reactionary system.

Robert Penn Warren—the "cultured" author of that "expose" of Huey Long (All the King's Men)—is busy counseling "gradualism" and "explaining" the South, although it does not differ in any fundamental way from South Africa's apartheid.

The Negro may have no one to look to but himself at the moment, but it is precisely the strength and sweep of his independent struggles that have brought the whites with him throughout American history from the Abolitionist movement to the early CIO. It will again call forth the rank and file of labor who, on their own, are looking for a totally new way of life.
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LIFE MAGAZINE REWRITES AMERICAN HISTORY
LIFE magazine, the internationally reputed, rabid, Republican, Luce publication, is busy selling the "American way of life" abroad. It is also busy whitewashing "the Southern way of life" up North.

Having begun to display its "understanding" of white-supremacy South, some time back, with a salvo by that Nobel-prize winner, Faulkner—who announced his readiness to defend the Southern way of life by the spilling of Negro blood—LIFE followed up with a current series of articles called "Background to Segregation."

The background begins way back—some 400 years back—in Africa, where some kings sold some of their own people into slavery. This, according to LIFE, is supposed to shed light on the institution of American slavery. Presumably this also explained the background to today's disgusting resistance to the elementary question of desegregation in schools—100 years after the South lost, militarily, the "War Between the States."

No one in his right sense would have expected a magazine like LIFE to write the true history of the Negro—of the mass revolt against slavery in the South and the mass flights of slaves from the South which finally led to the Civil War.

Nor would one expect LIFE to write the true history of the great Negro-Abolitionists like Sojourner Truth, Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, David Walker and countless others who helped mold a nation anxious to free all its citizens.

LIFE says that the cotton economy was an excellent objective for the achievements of the only true democracy that the South ever attained, through the "black parliaments" during the Reconstruction period, or of the present Negro struggle for freedom.

Through LIFE we get only white Southern thoughts on freedom for capitalist North. Planter South knows only the white South and not the true, civilized South of freedom-loving Negro Southerners.

No argument can ever break open the skulls of this degenerate cultural alignment.

The climax of this degeneracy is reached by LIFE when it maligns the most glorious page of American history—that written by the Abolitionists. LIFE labels them "incendiaries" and in the same breath finds words of praise for the origin of the Ku Klux Klan! "Many of the Klan's early leaders," writes LIFE, "were men of dignity, ex-Confederate officers."

We do not doubt that the leaders were ex-Confederate officers. But those "men of dignity" were the founders of lynch-law, while the men against whom they moved—the freedmen, the Negroes—constituted the only constitutional bodies that ever brought the South any democracy and public education.

Nor was it true then, nor is it true now, that white South was afraid of "mongrelization," in which they were the greatest participants all through slavery.

No, the truth is, it was not the Negro the Southern white feared, but the white.

White man down South fears white man. There is not a man among the "cultured" South who can stand up to the KKK or the White Citizens Councils because none has a single principle for which it is worth fighting.

Courage comes, not out of gentility or this air, but out of conviction that you are part of and represent the wave of the future—as the Negro struggles for freedom does and the "Southern way of life" does not.

Having lost on the battlefield, but not in the economy, the restriction to freedom now assumed a new form.—shortening. Thus, the planter South entrenched its way of life by the rape and the flagging of the KKK; the politics of the Eastlands; and now again, mole-rat against the Supreme Court.

If the White Citizens Council can burn crosses in Washington, D. C. on the front lawn of the United States Supreme Court Justices — and the FBI appears helpless—why should not Faulkner of Mississippi or Hudding Carter and "other liberals" fear for their lives, from whites, where the military might of the state supports that Southern-way-of-life?

Oppression has ever worn a white face down South. Now, so does the degeneration of its "culture." So do its Northern friends who are so sophisticated as to travel the world "to sell the American way of life." But the European will not buy. He will not buy because he is stretching his hands to another American, and another South, whose struggles for freedom are heard over the small voice of segregation. LIFE—R. D.
TWO WORLDS

THE ABSENCE OF A MASS LABOR PARTY

IN THE U.S.

Although it has no labor party of its own, labor dominates the current election campaign. That is natural since they constitute the majority of the population and this is the time when everyone in out to get "the labor vote."

IT'S FANTASTIC

The labor bureaucracy is busy "getting out the vote" for one of the capitalist parties—the Democratic Party—while the other capitalist party is suddenly showing a hypocritical concern with the right-and-fight's détente of their labor leadership. From the fact that the trade union heads "cannot deliver the labor vote," the Republicans draw the fantastic conclusion that they will have the labor vote.

The absence of a mass labor party is the fundamental factor in American life. It underlies the politics of the big parties as well as the little groupings, the daily lives of people and the general direction of the nation's development.

There is certainly no stranger phenomenon anywhere in the world, than the Democratic Party which, since the Depression, has gotten the labor vote. Here is a capitalist party which, within one and the same body, contains the most reactionary element in American life—white supremacy South which is openly boasting of its "contented" (that is to say, non-unionized, underpaid, sweat labor)—and the labor vote of the workers. This is due to the absence of a labor party.

It isn't that the workers, during the Depression, left their fate up to the NRA. Quite the contrary. They built their own organizations, the CIO. They did that to the astonishment of the world, in a few short years. But they voted Democratic.

THE REALLY BACKWARD ONES

From this the small radical groups conclude that the American worker is "politically backward" and tell him, year in and year out, that he "should" build a labor party.

The labor bureaucracy itself, at least all it's words, threatens to do just that. For the old radicals, now is always the time to build one. For the labor bureaucracy, now is never the time to build one. Neither of them pay much attention to what the workers themselves are thinking on the subject.

In some respects, the American workers may be at a disadvantage in not having built a labor party. On the other hand, they may also see the advantage of not doing so and thus escaping the stranglehold of the bureaucracy that dominates the mass party in each country that now has one. In England, for example, the worker certainly had much less freedom of action when "its" labor party was the government.

It is true that during the war the labor bureaucracy tried to shackles the workers with a "no strike clause." But the labor bureaucracy here is so weak, that wrangling went on all the time and, at the end of the war, the workers broke out in the GM general strike.

ONE THING IS CERTAIN

What to do now? No one can tell the workers. One thing is certain and that is the one thing that all forget, be they capitalist leaders or labor leaders: Big bureaucracy or little, old radicals or liberals.

The next fundamental political development will come from a new, a deeper layer in the population and not from the so-called most advanced, politicalized workers. It will come spontaneously, from below, and not be a plan hatched down above. That is why what form it will take cannot be known.

It may very well be that the American workers will "skip" this "stage" of traditional mass labor party. Just remember it was the completely new "raw workers" who formed the CIO— and changed the industrial face of America. It was not the AFL, which was transformed into the CIO. The CIO grew up out of other roots. Not only that. Even unions like the International Ladies Garment Workers Union which dis- formed part of the organizing committee, for industrial unionism, came from the pressure of those unorganized workers.

The people most ready to reorganize society were found not in the union apparatus, nor even in the "affirming" caucuses but among these "backward" workers.

—R.D.
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Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Hungary

"Russian soldiers, go home!" has become the central rallying slogan of the Hungarian revolution which broke out on October 23. The student youth seem to have been the ones who sparked this revolt. But there is no doubt whatever that the overwhelming majority of the people are not merely "behind" it, but are actively and actively participating in this struggle for freedom.

THE WORKING-CLASS METHOD

As in all popular revolts, the Hungarian workers have joined the workers who form the leading core of the revolution. A general strike tied up all, railroad transport as well as most production. Not only did this working-class method of fighting put its stamp on the revolt, but it thereby linked itself to the military strategy of the rebellion.

AGAINST "STALINEISM" AND "TITOISM"

What is new in this revolt, the way in which it is distinguished from the Polish revolt, is that the mass revolution is not only struggling against Russian imperialist domination. It is also against its own ruling clique, so-called Stalinist and Titoist alike.

Indeed, there is no fundamental difference between these two brands beyond as the relations with the workers are concerned.

The Hungarian people opposed Janos Nagy's "new" government, in which the only thing that is new is that some anti-Communists, but equally reactionary, small capitalists (Smallholders' Party) are included in the Central Committee. Small business capitalists and state capitalists are thus leagued with the Russians in order to put down the mass revolt.

THE FACE OF COUNTER-REVOLUTION

There is not a single word, in all the verbiage about national unity and about extricating the Russians troops out of Hungary, that there will be any change in relations at the point of production.

The attempt, on this side of the Iron Curtain, is to whitewash counter-revolution so long as it is not Russian. This is something the Hungarian working people are paying their lives down toston. They are who have suffered under the rule of the Five-Year Plans. This is true, not only of the so-called Stalinist version of plans, in Tito's Yugoslavia as in Gomulka's Poland as in Khrushchev's Russia, the production plans are directed against the workers.

Thus, for example, the so-called "New Course"—which was initiated after the death of Stalin when heavy industry targets were revised downwards—did not in any way change the conditions of production. The ruling rule remained "strict labor discipline."

In true state capitalism fashion, Gomulka, chairman of the National Council of the so-called Trade Unions, asked on January 12, 1956 that, "reeducation measures (read: jail sentences) must be taken against violators of work discipline."

Nagy, who was so busy talking about the "old sins," did nothing to change that. In fact, in the midst of the revolution against him, he was still appealing for "national unity" against Russian occupation, he was already busy telling the Hungarian workers how tough things would be for the "first few months" after "order" has been established.

Revised production targets did nothing to change work "norms" (production quotas). On the contrary, until the actual outbreak, the Hungarian press was full of talk against workers' "compliance" to these targets and, while promising better wages sometime, in the future, the Nagys continued to talk of "work competitions" (tread: piecework and speedup) as the rule of production.

Stalinist or Titoist managers, even as both Ford and Reuther here, can think of no way of running production except on the backs of the workers.

IT DEPENDS ON THE WORKERS

At the same time, however, we must bear in mind the fact that in the popular revolt, too, there are two major forces. The life of the revolution depends on whether the workers or the middle classes gain the leadership.

The present attempts of the workers to seize oil fields, rail centers, steel factories and means of communication and to run these by revolutionary committees—that is to say, workers control of production—is the true sign that this revolution is attempting a total change. In that alone can lie its true success.

If Russia puts down this revolt by its superior military might, it will learn that no counter-revolution can, for long, still the new forces of revolution that have unfolded.

---B. X.

Tuesday, November 13, 1956
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Death, Freedom & the Disintegration of Communism

Death and starvation stalked the streets of Hungary as the radio loudly shouted out its 5 O'Clock News: "We are quiet. Not afraid. Send the news to the world."

The news to the world about five days of freedom revealed more than courageous fighting. It showed that you cannot kill the idea of freedom. That idea does not die in heaven. People live by that idea.

Overnight the one-party system disintegrated and various political parties reappeared along with small newspapers and radio stations.

Peasants and soldiers united with city workers—spearheaded by the incredible youth who braved Russian tanks.

Hundreds of local and district organizations from the Hungarian Revolutionary Youth Party to old parties, including both Smallholders and Social Democrats appeared.

So total was the wrath of the people against Russian Communism, that the Hungarian Communist Party tried to disappear. In a new guise. The temporary puppet leader, Janos Kadar, reorganized it as the "Socialist Workers Party," but no one took that seriously. Indeed it was the same old communist which, while pretending withdrawal of the Russian troops and a different way of living, was conspiring to bring back the Russian tanks and troops to force.

The news to the world was about five days of freedom from Russian tyranny, and from Hungarian communism banishing 15,000 men secret police. And now, the news is that the wrath of a people is being stifled by a force of 4,500 Soviet tanks, crack paratroopers, million guards and a quarter of a million Russian infantry.

The manner of the daring young Freedom Fighters has not, at this moment, subdued the revolt. After a full week of fighting, the uranium mines have been blown up. The workers are still on general strike and there is neither transport nor production. The Hungarian people are choosing death rather than accept Russian totalitarianism.

BOTH SIDES ON "THE OTHER SIDE"

Ever since the Russian counter-revolution moved in, the radio on this side of the Iron Curtain has been no better than the one on the other side.

First, they have taken the Russians' word for it that the revolution has been totally crushed.

Then, they announced that there evidently was "sporadic" fighting left, while the continuing resistance was brave but it was "pitiful."

And now, the whole pack of journalists, led by "the poet" Walter Lippman—under the pretexts of being for "maintaining the peace"—favor Tito and Gomulka type of Communism rather than the independent, "useless," dying of the Hungarian revolutionaries.

While doing nothing, the Western Big Power leaders are all busy harking in on the deeds of the courageous fighters to glamorize themselves with the blood of the Freedom Fighters.

While the Hungarians are dying by the thousands and asking for action, not for words—everyone, from President Eisenhower through Tito of Yugoslavia, (not to speak of Portugal, which is hardly known for its "democracy"), is big on words and zero on action.

No wonder the West cannot possibly become a polarizing force for those who want a totally new way of life and control of production.

THEY WILL NOT DISAPPEAR

The revolutionary forces now unleashed cannot be overcome by sheer force. They may be forced underground but they will not disappear. Nor will their impact be exhausted within the national boundaries of Hungary.

Already, in Western Europe, we see the beginning of the disintegration of the mass Communist Parties. Ever since the end of World War II, the West European people—veering sharply against the private capitalism that they know and hate because it had brought them two world wars in one lifetime—had turned to Russian Communism, literally by the millions.

They now see Russian Communism as but another name for state capitalism. They are tearing up their Communist Party membership cards by the thousands. (See "Our Life and Times," p. 8.) The question is: Where will they go now that they see both poles of world capital—United States and Russia—striving for world domination? I will take up this question in my next column. For now, we must stress that this tearing up of the CP membership cards stands as a python with the Hungarian revolution itself in swallowing the giant freedom out of the totalitarian stranglehold. R. D.
FREEDOM FIGHTERS BUILD BARRICADES IN BUDAPEST... This picture was taken on Sunday, Nov. 4. The Hungarian Revolt was nine days old at the time. It was before the brutal counter-revolution by the Russians. Since then the Hungarian workers have been fighting back with a general strike and courage that sets an example to the world.
TWO WORLDS

Italian Communist Party Faces Revolt Dec. 8

The Italian Communist Party, scheduled to meet on December 8, is facing the first major revolt in its ranks since the end of World War II.

At that time, ten years ago, when the Italian working-class rid itself of Fascism, and moved to establish its own rule, the Communists acted as the brake on that movement. It did so in the name of Marxism, the theory of workers' liberation.

It was possible, for Russian totalitarianism to usurp that name for two seemingly opposed reasons: 1) Behind it was the might of the Russian State and its army and its money; and 2) America was hated as the victorious Imperialist power trying to dominate Europe.

No fewer than two millions poured into the Italian Communist Party. It is the largest Communist Party on this side of the Iron Curtain. It is different from those on the other side of the Iron Curtain which are the ruling parties in the land, like the Republicans and Democrats here. The Italian workers joined it voluntarily in the belief that they would thus overthrow hated capitalism.

An entirely new way out was shown by the Hungarian Revolution. The self-activity of the Hungarian workers and youth showed there is an alternative to Communism and to the imperialistic camp of "Western Democracy."

Road to Independent Rule

The road to independent workers' rule overnight shattered the myth of Communism as any equivalent to Marxism and freedom. It shattered, as well, the myth of Western Democracy slinging against Russian totalitarianism.

Thousands have already torn up their Communist Party membership cards. But the Italian Communist Party still has the biggest mass base in Western Europe. All eyes therefore are on the December convention of the Party.

Only a fool like our ambassador to Italy, Clare Boothe Luce, can imagine that American democracy will have any effect on this convention other than to maintain the Communist Party hold on the workers. The one thing the Italian workers will not accept is the old capitalist order, whether it fascists or so-called democratic form.

RECRUITER FOR COMMUNISM

The biggest recruiter for Communism was McCarthyism, even as now it is the Voice of America. No one is less popular with the European masses unless it is the American labor bureaucrats who try to help sell "the American way of life" by whitewashing the Taft-Hartley Act as well as discrimination and segregation against Negroes. Such laws remain the most effective weapon the Communists have to keep Italians within their fold.

Added to the Western capitalists and labor bureaucrats, are the so-called vanguard groupings who have broken with "Stalinism" but remain chained to the concept of the backwardness of the working-class itself to achieve the reorganization of society. Hence the dependence on the Party State Plan. Because of this bureaucratic outlook, Trotskyism did not and could not become the polarizing force for workers looking for an alternative to private and state capitalism (Communism).

BANKRUPT RADICAL GROUPS

These groupings have exposed the bankruptcy of their own thoughts by constantly tailing down to the workers, publishing papers "for them" instead of by them. They have continued to act as an "avant-garde," that is, as elite looking down upon those on the "outside." Since those on the "inside" are very few, and those on the "outside" the great majority, they end up in nothing more than a mutual admiration society.

Now that the Hungarian Revolution has shown a new road toward freedom in practice, never was it more necessary to create a new unity of theory and practice in the manner in which Marx and Engels did it. It is done by creating out of the working-class struggles his theory of liberation.

Never before has there been such need for working-class relations on a world scale, not merely on the basis of what you are against, but on the solid foundation of what you are for. Unless you stand for a society where the working people, to a man, manage production and the state, that is, run their own lives and reorganize society on such new beginnings—yielding neither to capitalism nor to any newly-formed bureaucratic tyranny—there will be no independent polarizing force facing the Italian Communist Party which will get the millions to abandon it.

R. D.
TWO WORLDS

AUTOMATION AND BRAINWASHING

Automation has cut across the thinking of the people more sharply than anything else since the Industrial Revolution nearly 200 years ago.

At the point of production, automation has compelled two fundamentally different class attitudes, depending on which side of the machine you stand.

WHICH SIDE ARE YOU ON?

If you are the one who operates it, you feel its impact in every bone of your body; you are more sweaty, more tired, more tense and you feel about as useful as a fifth wheel. You are never on top of the machine; the machine is always on top of you and keeps you isolated from your fellow-workers. In addition, you feel more isolated as more and more of your shopmates are displaced by the monster machine.

If, on the other hand, you are the one who drives the men and counts the production for management, you praise the machine to the skies.

This attitude of the capitalists and their agents has acted as a brainwashing of the labor bureaucracy.

Instead of listening to the specific grievances and aspirations of the workers; instead of listening to their complaints against the conditions of labor and new speed-ups; instead of listening when the workers questioned the very kind of labor that would transform man into a cog of a machine and make the machine into “the thinker,” the labor bureaucracy counselled the workers to do nothing “against” automation. Thus, when the miners were first confronted with the continuous miner in 1940, John L. Lewis disregarded their general strike and announced instead that the union was for “progress.”

The working force in the mines was literally cut in half.

By 1965, automation reached Ford. Reuther told the auto workers to consider “the future” which would bring them a six-hour day, and not to fight against the present unemployment.

Meanwhile, there has been no change in the working day since the workers, through their own struggles over decades, won the eight-hour day as the turn of the century.

BRAINWASHED LABOR LEADERS

The latest result of this brainwashing of the so-called labor leadership can be seen in the way in which they let the professors do their thinking for them. There is not a college, from the University of Michigan to Harvard, that does not have its Technology Project. The labor bureaucracy appears at the conferences to parrot the words of “the educated.”

The actual findings of “case studies” are hidden behind the windy words of labor bureaucrats and professor. Take the case that every Detroit auto worker knows only too well—the closing down of the Murray Body Works several years ago. Five thousand workers found themselves with lots of time on their hands and no money in their pockets—they were out of work. The management, however, was “forward looking.” They went into another business—bowling alleys. They moved out of Detroit. The 8,000 auto workers remained in Detroit and remained unemployed.

Or, take the cases of those who remain on the job in automated plants. Contrary to the ease that push-button work was supposed to bring about, the workers all say: the more production, the more speed and tension.

Contrary to Reuther’s abstractions of every worker an engineer, there is little or no upgrading with automation.

What do the labor bureaucrats and the professors do with all these findings? Well, here are some of the questions they posed:

Mr. Ted F. Silvey, of the National Headquarters Staff of the AFL-CIO, stated that the problems they would have to face with automation are 1) labor scarcity, and 2) he saw that “more and more people will be relieved from that acquisitiveness which drives them to obtain personal property beyond all sensible human need.”

Professor Charles B. Walker, the Director of Research in Technology and Industrial Relations, and the President of the Society for Applied Anthropology which sponsored this conference, summed it up by worrying about: “What can we find as substitute for time?” (his own emphasis).

It is clear no torture chambers are needed to brainwash labor bureaucrats and intellectuals. They are too deaf to the concrete demands of the workers, and all too willing victims of abstractions which help maintain the capitalist system.

R. B.

Tuesday, December 25, 1966
TWO WORLDS

Hungary and Kenya: Two Fights for Freedom

Freedom has become the most abused word in the language these days. Everyone from Eisenhower to Nixon, Walters and Hartley (co-author of the Taft-Hartley Law) are suddenly "for" the Freedom Fighters in Hungary.

They do nothing to help the Hungarian revolutionaries who are carrying on the fight in Hungary itself. Instead, they pick and choose which of the Hungarian refugees they will allow into the United States, that is, those who would be "good security risks." But they wax poetic over the word, freedom.

TRANSFORMED INTO OPPOSIE

It all goes to show that there is nothing on earth that cannot be transformed into its opposite. When one fights for freedom from Russian rule, you play it big. But when one fights for freedom from British rule, as the people of Kenya have done for much longer than has Hungary, then not only do you not play it up, but you call that freedom fight the "fight of savages."

This was brought out at a lecture I gave and I wish here to report it.

Two young workers were discussing with an older worker the attitudes in their shops to the Hungarian Revolution. One thing they all agreed on was that the attitude of the Administration in office was a qualm in Vice-President Nixon's trip to Austria, was alienating the American workers' sympathy for the Hungarian refugees.

At the beginning of the revolt against Russian totalitarianism, the same workers were all talking not only about how to help the Hungarians but also how they "should do the same thing here in organizing our own factory committees to do our own negotiation instead of the union leadership." Now, the workers are asking, "How does it happen Washington is all for Hungarian refugees getting jobs, but they still use the Taft-Hartley law against us?"

The older worker said: "Let's not mix up the refugees and the Hungarian workers who have remained behind and are carrying on the fight there."

One of the young workers agreed, and said he noted that the Hungarian refugees were either professionals or highly skilled workers. None seemed to be production workers, at least none they showed on TV.

WHY NO 'CARE' PACKAGES TO AFRICA?

"But," he continued, "many of the guys in the shop were right when they said they wouldn't send CARE packages. They were asking, how does it happen that none of those packages were sent to Africa? Look at the people of Kenya have fought the British but all we ever hear of them in that the Africans who want Africa for themselves are 'savage.'"

There is no doubt that British brutality, in putting down the Mau Mau, more than matches the Russian brutality against the Hungarian revolutionaries.

There is no doubt that the Administration has its own reasons for allegedly being "for" the Hungarian Revolution. They are certainly against Russia and Russia has given them a golden opportunity to appear as if they were for the Hungarian revolution.

"But America is doing nothing for those who were the brunt of the whole fight in Hungary itself: the Hungarian Workers' Council. If there were a way to help them," concluded the older worker, "that is where I would send the help."

NEW WAYS OF FIGHTING

The rub of the question is what the workers inside Hungary herself are doing and how they are doing it. First, they are fighting in the factories which they are using as their places of refuge. The leaders of the Workers' Councils are arrested only after they left the factory and walked in the Parliament building to negotiate.

Secondly, the workers seem to have worked out new ways of fighting, both on the job and when they walk out on strike.

For example, the miners are refusing to mine coal until the Russian Army leaves Hungary. Nor are they letting anyone else mine the coal "for the workers."

When the Russians tried to take over the running of the mines, the workers threatened to blow up the mines. In fact, they did just that to some uranium mines and blew the whole plan to kingdom come. That the people of Kenya did the same thing to the British plans can be seen from the weakness of the British Empire. Nor has the last word been written to the Administration's pretense of being "for" freedom everywhere—except where they rule."—R.D.
TWO WORLDS

Youth and Workers in Present Revolts

One aspect of the report from the South (see page 33) once again discloses how organic to the youth of today is organization and revolt. No one has to teach them that. Quite the contrary. The older generation has much to learn from them. It has much to learn from the youth because there is nothing "technical" about mass organization. Revolt is only the obvious side of organization when that revolt is motivated by the struggle for a totally new way of life.

The vision of totally new human relations dictates the Negroes' method of struggle, their organization, their endurance, their heroism. This, the white South does not have. It is the white South, therefore, not the Negro, which "revolves in face of the reactionary White Citizens Council!"

Everyone recognizes 1933 as the year of revolution when the talk is of Hungary. Few see the social revolution going on down South. The Hungarian Revolution is the most dramatic and courageous. At the same time, the struggle of the Southern Negroes—and especially of the Negro youth of Montgomery, Alabama—is undermining the whole monstrous institution of oppression and segregation which the capitalist press so dilutely calls "the Southern way of life." This, and not guns, is the true mark of a social revolution.

With or without guns, this social revolution has been undermining the whole world of capitalist crisis and war. By questioning the right of either of the two gigantic piles of world capital—Russia and America—to dominate the world. In this struggle out of world chaos, the much-maligned youth of this generation—whether Hungarian or Southern Negro, Russian or Kenyan—has come to the forefront. Everywhere the youth is in revolt against this corrupt society which is in a perpetual state of warfare, moving from one crisis to another, and balancing the very fate of civilization on the tip of the balance.

1935 marked the first sharp dividing line between the youth of this generation and the so-called "lost generation" that arose after World War I. That "lost generation" found itself as part of an intellectual and administrative "bureaucracy" trying to order the new generation about.

Contrast the high school youth of 1935. In that year, 25,000 high school youths in New York City burned forth in demonstration for such seemingly trivial matters as sports and extra-curricular activities. They weren't led by any radical group. They led themselves. They had yet undergone the discipline of a factory, and yet in their methods of struggle they used working class forms—mass action.

One point in that demonstration had all the old radical leaders with no one to lead, glaring. It was when the youth had crowded onto the two vast sets of stairs in front of the court houses in Foley Square. The cops were trying to drive them off. Suddenly, the cry "Sit down!" went up and down the steps. In half a minute every kid was sitting down.

THE COHESIVENESS OF WORKERS

It was the same sort of action—a much grander "historical scale"—that electrified the whole world on October 23, 1936, when the Hungarian youth sparked the revolt against Russian totalitarianism. The weight soon shifted, however—of assembly it had to shift—to the working class.

The working class alone has the cohesiveness and power which comes from being so strategically placed at the point of production as to be able to stop all production. No true social revolution can proceed unless it begins on the factory level and changes the relations at the point of production. It is here that capitalism—which is being undermined from its position inside the backs of the workers, and rising on the division between mental and manual labor—endeavors to regain its position by bringing forth a seemingly new weapon against the new society. That seemingly new weapon is intellectual domination.

The important thing about the present revolt, the world over, is that the youth is in the forefront because of the totality of their own opposition to the existing society. This creates in this youth, including the intellectual and middle-class youth, attitudes very similar to those of the working class.

Once the working class takes the leadership and puts its stamp upon the form of struggle, its impetus merges with these impulses from the youth, and the doors are open for every layer of the population (that is, all those not connected in any way with the two state-capitalist societies fighting for world domination) to reorganize society on totally new beginnings. In this respect the struggle has only begun. It will not be completed until a new social order has emerged....—R.D.
TWO WORLDS

The Confidence Man in Literature & Life

One hundred years ago the great American writer, Herman Melville, wrote The Confidence-Man: His Masquerade. It was a story about a trip down the Mississippi in an old steamer called Piskey, or Faithful. Everyone on board was either a con-man or a sucker. Everyone was in the game, trying to get something for nothing or at the next man’s expense.

They talked about faith when they believed in nothing. They bragged that no one could fool them when they swallowed every lie. Although there was no violence aboard, it was a tale of horror, the horror that comes from man himself when he is a “man-charmer.”

Melville sums it up as “the mystery of human subjectivity.” The mystery, however, is dispelled when you look at the objective forces shaping the American of his day, 1850.

America was then four years away from the Civil War that was to tear out the old poison of slavery. But on the surface life went on unchanged and hypocritically pretended it would never change. The confidence racket was being played for stakes as large as life—the life of the Negro slave. It was this crisis of a nation that transformed the chauvinistic, self-centered con-man into “a social type.”

IT IS MORE CLEAR TODAY

We can see this clearer today than in Melville’s day not only because we look at it with hindsight, but because we too live in a birth-time of history when the great masses have not yet come on the historic stage to decide the form of the new society. The totality of the crisis the world over weighs one down oppressively and makes of us all play in the barbecue who now says “Have confidence in me and I will lead you to the new.”

This is especially true of Europe where “small working-class political groups look doubly menacing by the masses Communist parties they must face daily. Under the circumstances the adventurer who promises to overcome all this by the wave of a thesis has the ear of people who should know better, were it not for the fact that they too are out “to get rich quick.” I know one such con-man whom I shall call Jim. In America as well as the European expert who could bridge the difference between American and European politics by becoming an American. A decade that added up to zero returned him to Europe where he now passes as the American expert who has yet maintained his European origins and “grooms.” But although he breathes the free European air (uninhabitable as an civil rights are concerned), he remains incorrigible. Naturally this social type whom Melville long ago had called “man-charmer” as certain East Indians are called snake-charmers” would be swept away the moment the small working class groupings get into the stream of the mass movement. But for the moment he is there to plague small groupings even as American labor bureaus are there to prey on the mass movements.

TWO TYPES OF BUREAUCRATS

Two types of American labor bureaucrats swarm over Europe and Asia these days. One is the “working type” and the other the “stationary, vampire type.” Both wear fancy ties and smoke fat cigars and try to sell “the American way of life” as if the American world were one instead of two: that of the capitalists and that of the workers. Rather is the roving kind. He travels in to deliver a speech at a hand-picked labor congress, rides in a U. S. Army Jeep, and talks as the long-time brother. He returns to America to tell the American workers how much better off they are than the Europeans, not to mention the poverty-ridden Asian masses. After he had just told the latter how much better off they are “free.”

Irving Brown is the stationary kind. He is the international representative of the A. F. of L. who lives in Europe, is always there to meet and brief the roving kind of bureaucrat whom he “districts.” It is true that the two are as alike as tea and tobacco, but the stationary kind has the advantage of knowledge through bitter experience that he must sell Europe something more genuine than the legend that all Americans are millionaires, and that American workers, despite their constant wildcatting, dutifully follow their “labor leadership.” He knows he cannot win the minds of the European masses with more “anti-Russianism.” These people are as much anti-American as anti-Russian for they are fighting for a totally new way of life. In that we see the elements of the new society already present within the old which sweep away once and for all both the con-man preying on small political groups and the vampires of the organized labor movement.

—from D.
TWO WORLDS

The Terrible Split in the Scientist's Personality

The world crisis is so total that it pervades not only the relations of people at the point of production, but in every sphere of society, and none more so than the field of so-called pure science.

There was a time when the field of abstract theory was the most remote ivory tower and the scientist was issued complete privacy and non-interference from the everyday world with its cares. The splitting of the atom in World War II also split the scientist into a dual personality, and tore apart his individual pursuits and the social consequences of his discoveries.

The greatest scientist of this age, the late Albert Einstein, tried to suggest that the Japanese be induced to peace terms, not by destroying their cities and raining death upon the people, but by inviting the Japanese leaders "to watch" the havoc of an A-bomb explosion in mid-ocean or some deserted spot. Needless to say, the military brass paid no attention to him. So far as they were concerned "the field of specialization" was science—not military strategy or politics. Men of smaller stature than Einstein attempted not to think at all rather than face the consequences of their discoveries, as they are put to use (abuse) by the capitalist world.

Recently the American Association for the Advancement of Science attempted to take one step out of its neutral position by recognizing the right of scientists to define their views on their own discoveries. To judge by the immediate hostility of the capitalist press, you would have thought that the scientists were a group of minor, a little on the retarded side. They were reminded that being a good scientist is no sign that his opinion on other subjects would be of any value. Evidently having enough money to own a newspaper and hire writers entitles you to an opinion on every subject and makes you a judge of "true patriotism."

THE CRISIS AMONG THE SCIENTISTS

The greatest stumbling block to the scientists' finding out their relationship to society, however, comes not from those outside the field of science, but from the scientists themselves. If the totality of the crisis is so "ill-defined" it is "too big" to think about, the field of science the impact of that crisis, on all intellectuals leading two lives, makes most of them anxious to conform, and some even willing to commit intellectual prostitution.

Where the pressure upon scientists is such that a Robert Oppenheimer would show his conformity and lecture the youth of this country what a great, "free" exciting field science is, an Edward Teller would white-wash every Administration move, including the exclusion of Oppenheimer from access to scientific data because of his hesitation to give the go-ahead for the H-bomb fast enough.

The present so-called father of the H-bomb, Edward Teller, now writes that nuclear attack need not be totally destructive. This scientist has a practical plan which he makes sure does not become a point of agitation among the people by publishing it in the Journal, Air Force. He states that it is possible to store away two years' supply of food, medicine, and all things that would sustain life when the industrial plants have been blown sky-high if we build for storage and the saving of lives, thousands of "deep underground shelters that any in the densely populated areas in this country can walk to a shelter within 15 minutes. These things will be extremely expensive. But I am not sure it can be done. But I think there is at least a chance that it might be done."

Needless to say, the practical Mr. Teller has not dared propose that any of the $72 billion dollar budget be used for building these numerous shelters to avoid total destruction. No, but he is free with the type of advice that nowরু বিনস্টেশন.

WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE?

If the head of the A-project during the war, Oppenheimer, is not hock enough to have access to high priority scientific data; if what a Teller tells becomes "the truth"; if you must, to enter the field of science, give up all idea of any privacy in your life and pursue discoveries without directions acceptable to the Administration; then what precisely is the difference between "democracy" and "totalitarianism"?

Now that science is firmly wedded to war, and the time lag between pure and applied science has gone down from 20 years at the turn of the century to 5 and in war, "dissent 1 or 2 years, then on neither side of the Iron Curtain does there seem to be any room for it. No wonder that the scientist himself is split in more ways than the stem itself—R.D.
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Tuesday, February 19, 1957.
TWO WORLDS

Exclusion of Negroes Warps Mind of Whites

This is the time of the year when many books appear on "The Great Emancipator," Abraham Lincoln. As if the Negroes are not part of this nation, this is also the month of Negro History Week, celebrated almost exclusively by Negroes.

The split of this country into two worlds—white and Negro—warns the mind of the white much more than it does the Negro.

In a small way this warping can be seen in the books on Lincoln. The current crop are so superficial as they have been for nearly a century, because the white historian will not seriously grapple with the life and time and the activity of the Negro people in the era of the Civil War.

It is as if, during that great turning point of history—1861 to 1865—history didn't turn at all. At best, the Second American Revolution is presented as a mere economic development which made this country the great industrial land it is, without any least remaking, or being remade by live people. Let us turn instead to one of the live people of that critical era, the Negro David Walker. He made history then, and his utterances are more alive today than this month's crop of books on Abraham Lincoln.

DAVID WALKER'S APPEAL

In 1829, no extraordinary sensation was caused by the appearance of a pamphlet entitled, Appeal to the Colored Citizens of the United States, that legislatures in the South were called into special session to enact laws against free Negroes as against slaves for reading it. They put a price of $5,000 on the head of its author, David Walker.

David Walker was a free Negro from North Carolina who had settled in Boston where he earned a living by collecting rags. His Appeal was addressed to the free Negroes. He took them to task for their meekness. He urged them to make the cause of the slave their own because the wretchedness of the free Negroes' condition was due to the existence of slavery.

Walker urged them to make freedom their business. He pointed to the superiority of Negroes, in numbers and in bravery, over the white. He took the great to task as well—especially Thomas Jefferson. Prophetically, he wrote that race prejudice would yet "root some of you out of the very face of the earth."

36,000 copies of this 70-page pamphlet were sold and circulated from hand to hand. Those who could not read had others read it to them. The South trembled at the simple words of an obscure Negro.

The Cambridge Modern History writing that "the excitement produced by Walker's Appeal had not subsided when the danger of writings of this sort was brought home to the slave-owners by a rising of slaves in Virginia—an outbreak known as 'Nat Turner's Insurrection.'"

What the historians fail to see is that it was not "writings of this sort" that produced the revolt, but the revolt that produced the writings. Before Nat Turner and the Appeal, there was Denmark Vesey and the Underground Railway. The revolts of the Negro slaves were in fact one continuous chain of struggles from the moment they were brought to this country in chains of bondage. Those slave revolts not only produced the writings, but the actual Civil War.

The Negroes had no money, no guns, no vote, no party. They were armed only with their feelings for freedom and the certainty that they were right and could not and would not be kept down.

THE ABOLITIONISTS & TODAY'S HISTORIANS

Out of the genius of America, with no assistance from any alien tradition, there emerged the great Abolitionist movement which combined white and Negro in the cause of freedom.

As Wendell Phillips put it: "We do not play politics: anti-slavery is no half-jest with us; it is a terrible earnest, with life or death, worse than life or death on the issue. It is no sold-out, where it matters not to the good feeling of opposing counsel which way the verdict goes, and where advocates can shake hands after the decision as pleasantly as before."

This great American saw more clearly 100 years ago than the intellectual sees today. He saw, that even the Civil War would not establish new human relations unless "the blacks (became) the very basis of the effort to regenerate the South. We want the 4 million of blacks—a people instinctively on our side and ready and skilful to work; the only element in the South which belongs to the 10th century."

Until the historian today begins where Wendell Phillips left off he will be unable to understand either the history of his country or its future perspectives.

—R.B.

Tuesday, March 5, 1957.
TWO WORLDS

New Passions & New Forces

Now passions and forces in the struggle against the labor bureaucracy have come to the fore in the local struggles against the Reutherites. The workers in some Chrysler shops have moved from wildcathing to organized action whereby to challenge the bureaucratic strangehold over their Union. When the Reutherites got wind of the rank and file opposition, they flooded the factories with green leaflets, demanding that the opposition state its "program." For those bureaucrats "program"-writing is easy and they will promise anything. This, the workers know from long experience.

The Rank and File caucuses refused to enter into a "program"-writing contest. Instead, they stated what they were against - against the labor bureaucracy's domination over the workers in the union hall as on the production line. Every worker understood and voted accordingly. The rest is history - for the first time in 10 years they swept the election in Local 212 (see News & Letters, 3-25-57).

The Rank and File caucuses would not fit any of the old descriptions of "organised action." They had come into existence only a few weeks before the election for delegates to the UAW convention became connected with the proposed dues increase. They didn't bother to elect officers until the week of the election itself.

While, individually, one or another on their slate may have been a member of some former opposition caucus, this caucus had no connection with any of the old caucuses from the Trotkylites to that "most loyal opposition" led by Stelhato. As for the Communists, for the moment they are not supporting Reuther.

Yet new formations in opposition to Reuther could have been discerned during the wildcats in 1955. In our analysis of the new stage of struggle against the labor bureaucracy then, we pointed to the new formations among workers. In one instance it took the nebulous form of merely walking to the back of the hall while the leadership sat on the platform. We wrote: "That is how the hunger for unity of purpose and action, born on the picket line, expressed itself." (News & Letters, July 25, 1955).

Where, in 1965, the workers expressed their opposition by staying in the back of the hall, they don't want their leaders on the platform at all now.

The most intemperate cry today is: put them back on the production line.

THE WORKERS' NEW CONFIDENCE

The Rank & File caucus not only overthrew the labor bureaucrats, they also overthrew the old "program"-writing radicals. These would-be leaders, even as the present leaders, come with a "program" that is boundless in its promise but reduces itself to the same old story: follow them. They will lead. They know.

Last, these old radicals be too quick with their conclusion that if the workers do not follow them, they are "backward," let them ponder over these words of Lenin to a "program"-writer of his day:

"When Kloschev, in a moment of ministerial abandon, threatened to deprive the capitalists of 100% profit, he really offered us in that speech a sample of a plan calculated to impress. It is just such phrases that are always used to deceive the people by bourgeois parliamentary representatives. . . . Down with all this fraud of bureaucratic bourgeois political pretense! The workers must demand the immediate establishment of actual control, to be exercised only by the workers themselves. . . . If this is lacking, the rest is sheer deception."

There is no more horrifying proof of this than present-day Russia itself. It is toward such barbarism that the old radicals, along with the American labor bureaucracy, are leading with their attitudes toward the workers.

They fail to see what is new: the workers' confidence in themselves. Where old radicals have reduced the question to "program," the workers have reduced it to the decisive question: WHO will control production standards in the factory: workers or labor bureaucrats in cooperation with management? WHO will rule in the union hall: rank and file workers or the so-called leaders who haven't seen a production line in the last 20 years?

Confidence in themselves is all the workers need in their struggle to win back control of their union. It is the only thing that will win them a say over conditions in the factory. That is the problem today, not only in Local 212, but in the country as a whole and in the world over, if civilization itself is not to come down in a crash because of the marxists of the present rulers. The workers alone can control production and build a new society, and nobody else can.
TWO WORLDS

On Both Sides of the Iron Curtain

The latest U.S. Supreme Court ruling against the UAW's participation in political campaigns; the railroad through the Indiana legislature of the infamous "Right to Work Law"; the enactment by Southern states of laws to circumvent both the Constitution and the latest rulings to grant the Negroes their civil rights—all are but one chapter in the Administration's move to curtail the American people's rights.

THE METHOD OF MADNESS

Although in 1953 McCarthyism seemed an individual madness, by 1954 it had suddenly and actually become the law of the land. The Communist Control Act claimed to have outlawed the Communist Party as its aim, but the use of it has been solidarity anti-labor.

For example, it was used against the Montana copper miners who belong to the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union, which had been branded by the CIO as Communist dominated, a cry since taken up by Attorney General Brownell. The head of the Subversive Activities Control Board openly admitted that the vote of the Montana copper miners for a union of their own choosing would count for nothing; that what mattered was not the democratic vote of the membership of the union, but the ruling of Attorney General Brownell. After 3 years the Attorney General is moving again with a petition to reopen hearings against the union before the Subversive Activities Control Board.

For one who has studied Russia as closely as I have, I cannot help but feel that economically and politically the administration is moving in the same direction as the one-party totalitarian state on the other side of the Iron Curtain.

THE ATTORNEYS GENERAL: BROWNELL AND VISNISKY

Day in and day out the Administration is fighting hard to make this country more and more like Russia. Already it has abolished any serious distinction between Attorney General Herbert Brownell and Attorney General Andrei Vishinsky of the infamous Moscow Trials.

The Attorney General of Russia could become the role despotic interpreter of the vicious Russian laws because long before the purges the rights of labor had been taken away and the trade unions had been incorporated as part of the state apparatus, that is to say, they had been destroyed as independent organs of the working people.

This is the aim of the latest Supreme Court ruling against the UAW, even as the use of the Communist Control Act against labor is the aim of Attorney General Brownell. At the same time the South is using it against the NAACP.

A CONSPIRACY AGAINST THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

By a stroke of the pen Congress thrust democracy out of the window. The Attorney General's decision has become all-important and the workers' vote has been declared null and void. Yet the Senators and Congressmen had the gall to pronounce this a law against "the Communist Conspiracy." In truth, this law is the greatest conspiracy against the American people.

The independent Negro struggle in the South and the rank and file labor revolt in the North will stay the hand of the Administration in its headlong rush to transform this country into a carbon copy of Russian totalitarianism with American names.

Under whatever name, the working people know that the control of every phase of daily living—especially the way workers work in turning the wheels of production—would be a step toward total war and the destruction of civilization as we know it. The aim of the daily struggle is to stop that. This is the one thing the Administration cannot control in its move to make this country like Russia. The American people don't and won't take it. To aim at totalitarian power is one thing. To succeed is another.

—R.D.
TWO WORLDS
NEW CRISIS IN RUSSIA

A new internal crisis is brewing in Russia. On March 30, the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party passed an edict for the "decentralization" of Russia’s highly centralized, planned economy.

The report of Nikolai Khruostchey, spelling out the meaning of this shake-up of the Administration of the State Plan, took up no less than two-thirds of all the leading newspapers’ space.

RUSSIAN WORKERS IN CONTINUOUS REVOLT

As usual, the daily press in America sees only the maneuvers on top and is blind to — or deliberately ignores — the revolts of the Russian workers from below which causes the maneuvers on high.

I do not mean to say that the workers went this decentralization. They know that whether the desk of the State Planner is in Moscow or in the district where the factory is located they will have to work harder, like Ford’s "decentralization plans," the Russian decentralization will not give the worker any voice in production.

No, neither the reorganization on top nor the fact that it was caused by revolt from below is the key to the current crisis in Russia. What is crucial is that the present decentralization will not stop the revolt from below.

Russian workers cannot strike. Their resistance is exploitation must therefore find other ways to express itself. The most common forms of resistance are continual slowdowns and high labor turnover. So great is the labor turnover in the building industry, for example, that the Plan approved at last year’s 20th Congress had to promise building workers that 10 per cent of an effect delay would be used for their own housing. But when First Deputy Premier Pervakshin reported on the success of the 1966 Plan he had to add that plans for an increase in labor productivity were "underfulfilled in the coal, lumber, machine tools, and building materials industries." And he also had to add that there had been "losses of working-time and unev. 1 work."

THE OLD TUNE: LABOR MUST PRODUCE MORE

Over the years and decades the Russian workers have been in continuous revolt against the State Plan. Millions of them are in forced labor camps as a result.

What is new now is that even among the millions of workers and peasants who are not in forced labor camps, who constitute the normal working force, the slowdowns have reached such a high peak since the 20th Congress (See NEWS & LETTERS March 30, 1966) that the Sixth Five Year Plan has had to be utterly scrapped.

A few months ago it was announced that the "planned rate of increase of economic expansion" had been cut from 13 per cent to 7 per cent. But the new Plan is no more acceptable to the workers than the old one because no less than 80 per cent of the total increase in industrial output in 1967 was "planned" to come from increased labor productivity.

During the past few months both Communist Party paper PRAVDA, and the government paper, IZVESTIA, as well as the so-called union paper, TRUD, have been full of sudden stories about "Violations of Labor Law."

Management is blamed for dissolving workers without cause and trade unions are blamed for being "careless in analyzing worker complaints." And, while Khruostchey has carried out a campaign to get the lesser bureaucrats away from their desks and "into the fields," management has blamed government for the housing shortage. As one manager put it, "It is rare that housing is ready at same time as factory building ... (and this) greatly complicates recruiting of workers."

But all the bureaucrats — government management and the intellectuals — are united in one thing: to take it out of the hands of the worker. "Some persons," says the outraged, well-fed, well-housed manager, "take a job only to obtain housing and then leave jobs in search of better circumstances for themselves."

At the head of all the bureaucrats, of course, stands Khruostchey, the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party and the political boss over all planning, the new "decentralized" kind as well as the "centralized" kind. As usual, it all rests on "raising labor productivity."

The struggle over labor productivity is the class struggle which is tearing at Russian totalitarianism. It will not rest until the workers have finally succeeded in overthrowing it. — R. D.
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Tuesday, April 18, 1967.
TWO WORLDS
The Shorter Workweek, Productivity & Profits

The mentality of the labor bureaucracy is so completely capitallist that it has transformed the demand for a shorter workweek into a complete abstraction. It couldn’t spell out how the unions would fight for the shorter workweek for the simple reason that he sees labor productivity under capitalism not as the extra sweat of the workers, but as he puts it, “the increased productivity of the tools of production.”

I have underscored the word “tools,” because in precisely what the capitalists and their theoreticians claim as the reason why they are “entitled” to the extra profits from automation and need not “pass it on” to the workers to whom machinery has always meant just two things: speed-up and unemployment.

“THE NEW CONCEPT” AND MARXIAN THEORY

It is not by accident that the present-day bourgeois economists have rediscovered the trick of measuring labor productivity by attributing to the machine, instead of to the laborer, the power of creating profits. They now call this “the new concept,” and they openly admit that the illusion for it is the profit margin’s downward trend.

It is doubtful that many readers of News & Letters go in for reading the big business weeklies that have raised this lie and cry about the decline in profit “margins.” And there is no reason to cry for the profitless, like General Electric, for example, who complain they “only” get a profit margin of 10.4 percent on $1 billion sales when in 1950, on only $2 billion sales, they got as high a profit “margin” (rate) as 18.9 percent.

DECLINING RATE OF PROFIT

There is no doubt, however, that as great as the mass of profits has been, there has been a decline in the rate of profit when you compare it to the total investment in machinery and payrolls. There is nothing new in this either.

Over 100 years ago Marx showed: (1) that only living labor creates surplus value (profit); (2) that technological revolutions compel the ever-greater investment in machinery, and, relatively, the ever-smaller investment in living labor; and that, therefore, (3) there is a decline in the rate of profit, no matter how great the mass grows with mass production.

“In order to produce the same rate of profit,” he wrote, “when the constant capital set in motion by one laborer increases tenfold, the surplus labor time would have to increase tenfold, and soon the total labor time, and finally the full 24 hours of a day, would not suffice, even if wholly appropriated by capital.” From this Marx concluded: “The real barrier of capitalist production is capitalist itself.”

One hundred years ago, even as now, the capitalist theoreticians just laughed at this inherent tendency in capitalism toward collapse. No doubt the present-day “new concept,” which, in reality, is as old as capitalism itself, is good for the souls of the capitalists. But it is doing nothing for the eviscerating permanence of capitalism as is shown by the fact that once again the capitalist theoreticians must face “the profit margin’s downward trend.”

WHAT KIND OF LABOR AND “TREASON”

Ever since the end of War II, the workers throughout the world, and especially in America, have raised the question of labor productivity on an entirely different plane. They have repeatedly rebelled against the kind of labor that has produced all these crises and wars. They have shifted this question from dealing with the fruits of labor—wages—to the kind of labor where the worker is more than an appendage to a machine.

The 1946-1947 series of strikes—from the GM general strike, to the power strike in Pittsburgh, to the GI’s demand for a speedy return home—spelled out for the capitalists the concrete matters of control of production and profits, unemployment, and shorter workweek.

The capitalists’ reactions were brazenly specified in their magazine, BUSINESS WEEK: “We couldn’t fight another war without dictating to everyone where to work, what to do, what to get paid for it... (and to treat) indentment to strike as ‘treason’.”

But did they leave this simply as a matter for discussion—they enacted into law the Taft-Hartley Act which tries to impose on this country the slave labor law operative in Russia and its satellites. At the same time they began to look for more automatic machinery in order to rid themselves of rebellious labor. Automation was the result.

Tuesday, April 30, 1957
LAbOR PRODUCTIVITY AND
THE SHORTER WORKWEEK

The first year of automation, 1950, did give the capitalists their biggest profits. But we are now back again to the fact that only living labor creates all the profits.

While the capitalist looks at living labor through his own out-of-focus spectacles of profit, his theoreticians face it from the point of view of labor productivity. That has become the hot issue. In 1954 and 1955 labor productivity increased by 4% per cent. Suddenly, in 1956, there was a sharp drop to a point where labor productivity increased only by 1 to 2% per cent. Not only that. These figures do not include the non-production workers.

Productivity figures never include non-production workers because only production workers produce all new values. Despite their public propaganda, the capitalists are realistic enough about their own concerns. This year, however, that hard fact of life has a special significance.

Spokesmen for management, no less than big labor leaders like Reuther, have been playing up Automation as the new wonder which has created so many jobs, particularly in selling, distributing, servicing — white-collar jobs in general. Now, they have to confront the fact that these non-production workers are such a brake on increase in productivity that they have nearly wiped out any gain in labor productivity this year.

NO CUT IN HOURS FOR 50 YEARS

This truth, however, does not change the fact that it is the production workers who do create the new products and whose sweat creates the extra profit for the capitalists. They have not gained any shortening of the workday since 50 years ago when they first won the 8-hour day. It is these production workers who now want the shorter workweek.

But it is these production workers whom Reuther has subordinated both to the skilled and to the white-collar workers, whom he does not have, and who already work a shorter workweek than the production workers. Until they give up his skull to their power, no shorter workweek will be won.—E.D.
TWO WORLDS

"We Need a Clean, Clean Sweep"

(Note: This week I am turning my column over to a letter we received from a Chrysler Local 212 production worker which shows the tremendous gape that separates the Retheriter from the rank and file.—R.D.)

"Chrysler moving the Stamping Plant to Twinsburg, Ohio, has torn people up from one end to the other. People don't know if to sign up to move, or not to sign up. The Retheriters running this Local 212 say one thing and the company says another and they've got the production workers caught in the middle.

"WE'RE NOT DUMB"

"They think they're dealing with a bunch of dumb people, but we're not dumb. We're in this mess all day, we see it and we know it. We know something's got to be done about what's going on, for after all it'll be too late. We're going to have to win this election from the Retheriter green slate if we're to have any chance at all.

"At a Local membership meeting on Sunday, April 28, Pres. Pat Carese told us not to let the company move dies until they settled those 4 issues: 1) men going to Ohio with the job to carry their full seniority with them; 2) housing projects to be ready in Twinsburg for the men when they get down there; 3) any money the men would lose in moving their homes would have to be made by Chrysler; 4) to bring back the cushion jobs that were lost here at the 37 changeover.

"EMPTY PACKAGE"

"This was the 'package' he offered and it sounded good over the mike, but when the package came down to us it was empty as usual.

"The following Tuesday, April 30, when we came into the shop the company had posted a bulletin on the clock that they had reached an agreement with the Union, and that we had 14 days to sign up if we wanted to move. Now, it seems they reached an agreement with the International back February 15. We didn't know anything about it the way they're explanatory. It's not that we don't want to work."

"How are they going to get the Company to make up what the men lose in moving their homes. If they couldn't even keep the cushion department back if they go around telling workers to move or they'll be lost?

"—AND NOTHING DONE ABOUT IT"

"This is how the shop has been going for at least the last 3 years and getting worse every year. Men getting fired and no effort to bring them back. Men walking the streets and nothing done about it. More of us are going to be unemployed and the Union does nothing. There's been plenty of grievances written and nothing done about them.

"The worst began in the '56 model. The Company cut manpower but ran the same production. Their plan was that they were getting ready for automation. The chief steward said the same. After automation it was worse. The workers would go to the chief steward—the afternoon chief steward would lay it on the day chief steward, the day chief steward would lay it on this, that and the other. Nothing was done.

"That is why I was heart and soul for the Rank & File at the last delegate election when we swept the green slate out. There was a new feeling of confidence among the production workers in the shop. I will admit that some confidence has been lost in the Rank & File since then because it's a fact that a few opportunists have worked themselves in. But they can't have any idea that they can stand alone without the workers, because they do not have a machine. We don't have to work anywhere as hard to get rid of a couple of bad apples as we would to get rid of the green slate machine if they got back.

"WE CAN GET RID OF THE MACHINE"

"We need a clean, clean sweep and that is why I am going to vote the Rank & File slate again in the Local elections next week.

"We can get rid of the green slate machine and not let a new one be built. If we rank and file workers in the shop take this Local back, we can make sure that the new slate knows they are nothing without the production workers.

"They will have to give each and every man in the shop EQUAL consideration and work directly with the workers. They must not be allowed to promise one man a better job at another man's expense. They will have to take care of each man's problem as it comes up.

"We know what the problems are because we've been living with them for too long. Now we have got to do something about it and we have got to start with a clean sweep."
TWO WORLDS

Scientists, Civil Rights, War & Peace

The pressure the Administration is putting on the
2,000 scientists who signed the petition calling for an end
to H-bomb tests raises the whole question of civil rights
in yet a new light.

Herein, we have asserted the deprivation of civil
rights with minority groups, mainly Negroes, and, second-
dariely, so-called Communist groups. In actuality, the anti-
Communist laws are so broadly phrased that they can be,
and are, used against labor.

It was also clear, when the Administration moved to
deny Oppenheimer access to nuclear data (even data he
himself developed), that on the question of "security" no
one would be permitted to have an opinion that differed
from that of the Administration. Still, his civil rights were
not tarnished with.

A NEW LOW IN BIGOTRY

Now, however, Senator Eastland—who is a bigoted
master of depriving Negroes of their civil rights in the
halls of Congress as well as in his home State of Missis-
sippi—asked Dr. Linus Pauling, who circulated the peti-
tion against further H-bomb tests, to appear before his
Senate Internal Security Committee. The whispering cam-
paign is on that "Communists" are behind this act. (No
doubt the same "Communists" who were on the backlist
of anti-Communism, former.)

The Administration told Dr. Pauling that he could not
participate in the petition on Government property. If, in the
process, the scientists' civil rights fell by the wayside, that
was the least of the worries of our Government bureau-
crats. It is clear that there is no difference on either side of
the Iron Curtain in the way scientists are expected to
see the narrow and crooked political path of their respect-
ive governments.

There is no greater breach of genuine Russian
Communism throughout Western Europe, as well as
America, than such actions by the Administration.

Here we have a case of 2,000 scientists—among whom
are three Nobel Prize-winners, including Dr. Linus Paul-
ing himself—who are so aroused by the harmful effects
of the H-bomb tests, that, despite all pressure put upon
them, it took only 2 days to collect these signatures. Near-
ly half of the signers are not nuclear physicists, but geol-
ogists and biologists, concerned with the health of our
nation at peace. Their manifesto naturally speaks of the
dangers of man-made radiation, but it is addressed to the
governments, not to the people. It asks for an international
agreement to stop the testing of nuclear bombs.

It seems, however, that you cannot tell the truth on
any subject whatever without inviting the "Communist"
label. Evidently the only true patriots are those who are
so hell-bent on war that they would endanger the lives
of the nation at peace. Nothing indeed so exposes the
hollowness of the peace, which is nothing but an inter-
lude between wars.

BOTH SIDES OF THE IRON CURTAIN

The Russian prototype of Senator Eastland and Presi-
dent Eisenhower is the First Secretary of the Communist
Party, Nikita Khrushchev. The excuse that this master
of double-talk gives, for not even announcing H-bomb
tests, is that Russia is such a vast land compared to the
"smallness" of America.

Japan bears witness, however, that radiation fall-out
in Siberia endangers the Japanese. There is no doubt
at all that it also endangers the lives of the Russian people,
but their rulers care as little for them as ours do for us.
Both turn a deaf ear to the scientists as well as to the
popular protests against these bomb explosions.

That this cannot go on forever, is seen from the fact
that Britain did not dare to complete all of its tests.

The British authorities stopped short on the ground
that they already gained "enough information" from the 3
explosions they did make. We do not know about the nu-
clear information thus gained, but we do not doubt at all
the information they gained about the people's anti-war
feelings.

Therein lies the whole, and only, answer to the mad
rush to war on the part of the two state-capitalist giants
—Russia and the United States. The working people
alone can stop war.

Capitalism, built on the exploitation of man by man,
has brought our world to the very edge of a single
lifetime. The fact that the inevitable Third World War
seems to put the very survival of civilization into question
does not stop this competition for world domination.

A STRUGGLE AGAINST TYNANNY

We live in an age of absolutes—on the threshold of
full freedom out of a struggle against total tyranny. The
lives of the working people depend not on exploitation of
man by man, but on their freedom from capitalist explo-
tation. This spells a totally new way of life for all of hu-
manity. The scientists will learn that and be among the
working people, or they will end up as the scientists in
totalitarian lands have ended—being a part of the war
machine. The opposition to nuclear tests cannot and should
not be divided from the opposition to war. The anti-war
feelings of the people, not the international agreements
which aren't worth the paper they are written on, is the
only path to peace.

R. D.
TUESDAY, JULY 16, 1957

Only Freedom Can Solve The Crisis

[Editors' Note: Because of the limitations and scope of the following article—which was originally submitted for the "TWO-WORLD" column, page 2—we are printing it, instead, as the lead article for this issue.]

According to late reports, it seems likely that the State Dept. will finally allow American newsmen to travel to China so that the American public may at last receive first-hand reports about what goes on there.

At the same time, Chiang Kai-Shek, writing from his crisis-torn island of Formosa, has just published a book in America, in which he makes what amounts to a last plea to be restored to power on the

Nothing and no one can withstand the in ations in the land and oppression of Chiang Kai-Shek's regime. The truth of Communist China's totalitarianism cannot be learned from him nor those who speak for him. It can be glimpsed in the examination of the conflicts within China itself. It can be perceived by an analysis of what Communist Boss, Mao Tse-Tung, revealed in his speech on "Contradictions," that was released to the world on June 18th.

STATE CAPITALIST

The Chinese Communist regime is a state capitalist society. It was born out of the revolution against the corrupt feudal-capitalist society under Chiang-Kai-Shek. There is no doubt that when Chiang and his Kuomintang regime were overthrown, a much wider base was created for the new state capitalist regime. Chinese Communism was finally stripped of its feudal trappings and its corrupt war lords. Honest or otherwise, however, state capitalism is an exploitative society. Exploitation of man by man has its own consequences.

3 CHARACTERISTICS

The three primary characteristics of this development in China are: (1) Forced labor to build water conservation projects, highways and railways. Forced labor for excavation and construction of defense works, and labor-intensive. "This mass labor army was supposed to consist mainly of 'counter-revolutionaries.' But it was clear that there were not enough 'bureaucrat capitalists' and 'imperialists' to fill the mass labor projects, and the rebellious workers were their actual base.

(2) Under state capitalism, the function of free, or trade unionized labor, is not to increase its material benefits, but to fulfill the production quotas set by the State. Indeed, the Constitution openly boasts that the function of the trade unions is to increase production, raise labor productivity, and achieve the production plans of the State.

(3) Since 80 percent of the work in a country so under-developed as China is agriculture, the State must ask for what it calls "voluntary cooperation." That is to say, instead of just right confiscation of the land from its landlords, or its collectivization, only the land of those landlords who did not cooperate with the Chinese Communist Government was confiscated.

Otherwise, as in industry, so in agriculture, there are private farms as well as State farms, as well as joint private-State farms. The lot of the Chinese peasant is still the bowl of rice, and no more.

'LET FLOWERS BLOOM'

The internal crisis in this limited state capitalism has produced dissatisfaction among all layers of the population, including the intellectuals. The total of the crisis produced Mao Tse-Tung's sensational speech which ordered, "Let a Hundred Flowers Bloom, Let a Hundred Schools of Thought Contend."

From this abstract freedom, however, Mao's particular totalitarianism was showing badly. Despite the many "flowers," it seems that only one, and only one, party, the Chinese Communist Party, must rule. Mao rejected the two-party system as a bad capitalist idea. It is clear that the so-called democrats, that is capitalists, parties can exist only under as they do not contend for power by any test of vote, much less of mass strength. Thus, has forced labor produced its own type of forced brain work.

MAO "DISCOVERS" CONTRADICTION

Mao Tse-Tung, ruler of China, Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, and leader of its Army, caused a world sensation with his speech on "Contradictions." The speech was made to a closed session of the Supreme State Conference, on February 27th. It was never released until June 18th, after substantial "editing."

It would seem, from the unofficial version of the speech, which appeared in Poland, that Mao had claimed to be the discoverer of contradictions. He stated that "Marx and Engels did not know about these problems." Lenin mentioned
between both capitalists, whom he calls "bourgeois" capitalists, and imperialists, and good capitalists, whom he calls "the national bourgeoisie." To deny that contradictions exist, in China, says Mao, "is to fly in the face of objective reality." That most certainly is true, but it is precisely this, which is the supreme manifestation of the class character of the regime.

Because he tries to reconcile the restless Chinese masses to the existence of capitalism, Mao has been compelled to redefine everything, including the concept, "the people." WHO ARE "PEOPLE"?

It seems that the people are not the working people, but all those who accept the Chinese Communist regime, which Mao defines as the leadership of the Communist Party and its Army. That is how he smuggled the capitalists into the concept, "the people." Mao says: "In our bourgeois society, contradiction between the working class and the national bourgeoisie is a contradiction among the people. The class struggle waged between the two is by large and large, a class struggle within the range of the people." That fits neatly into the concept that the N.A.C., and the administration, as well as Reuther, in this society, are "a people's capitalism." Just as, what we need to re-define in this country is the capitalist class, but the class character of the labor leadership, so what needs re-defining in China is not "the people," but the class nature of Chinese Communism.

CONTRADICTIONS—WITH & WITHOUT MAO

Mao warns: "Certain people in our country were delighted when the Hungarian event took place. They hoped that something similar would happen in China, that thousands upon thousands of people would demonstrate in the streets against the Government." He thinks that by admitting contradictions, which he says is facing up to objective reality to the extent of recognizing limited strike, he will thereby avoid open revolution. That accounts for his pride in "discovering" the law of contradiction. Mao thinks that the translation of the law of contradiction into Chinese will make everybody happy as if to recognize the crisis to solve it.

Now, it is not Mao, in the year 1957, who discovered the law of contradiction. Nor is it Mao who did. Mao retracted it from the great bourgeois philosopher, Hegel, who in the period 1803 to 1831 gave the law its most profound interpretation in The Phenomenology of Mind, Science of Logic, and The Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences. What Marx did, that in his own view was, was to show that it summed up the law of capitalism development, all of which he proved in the three volumes of his. In brief, Marx held that, whereas all class societies developed through contradiction, only under capitalism does it reach the intensity where by it can be transformed into its opposite—freedom from capitalist wage slavery. Capitalism, he maintained, produces its own guardian in the working class.

TRANSFORMATION INTO OPPOSITE

Just as Marx concretized this law for capitalism, so Lenin concretized it for the working class organization itself. At the outbreak of World War I, the Second (Socialist) International betrayed the working class. Lenin demonstrated that it was due to the fact that a part of the working class had become transformed into its opposite—the arbritwe of labor that profligated from the superprofits of imperialism, and thereby undermined the working class nature of the Second International.

In a different historic period—World War II—what happened to Communism, which became transformed from its Marxist liberating base into its opposite, a state capitalism totalitarian philosophy.
‘Let 100 Flowers Bloom . . .
But Only One Party Rule’

A reader of my article on China and Mao Tse-Tung’s perversion of Marxist philosophy (See: “Only Freedom Can Solve the Crisis,” News & Letters, July 16) writes: “I fail to see how you can call Mao’s speech on contradictions as the same species of totalitarianism as Stalin’s speeches on monolithism. Where Stalin’s word was law, Mao invites disagreement with his proclamation: ‘Let 100 flowers bloom. Let 100 schools of thought contend’.”

COMMUNIST DOUBLE-TALK VS. TOTALITARIAN REALITY

It will not take time out to tell the reader what he can hear daily on the radio—how short-lived was this invitation of Mao’s and how the official Chinese Communist press has now reversed itself. Claiming that “counter-revolutionaries” were taking advantage of the freedom of the press, the Communists put a stop to it.

Anyone acquainted with Communist double-talk should have been able to foresee this development since the very speech, which allegedly granted freedom to 100 schools of thought, also proclaimed that one Party, and only one Party, the Communist Party, may rule China.

TRANSFORMATION INTO OPPOSITIVE

There is no doubt that at one time the Chinese Communist Party was a workingmen’s party, and that Mao Tse-Tung had been a revolutionary who, for 2 full decades, had fought for the overthrow of the feudal-capitalistic regime of Chiang Kai-Shek. But once the party won power, it was not long before it became transformed into its opposite.

It is not the old moral question of “power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely.” But State power, when it becomes one with economic power at the point of production, becomes the boss over production. That is what Lenin saw at the birth of Communist State power and he warned his colleagues, the former revolutionaries, against “a passion for bossing.” It was in vain—in vain not alone for Stalin, the bureaucrat, but for the whole Russian Communist Party.

The same transformation into oppositive—of a one-time working class party becoming the ruling Party which plans production—is taking place in China. The Chinese working people refuse to accept this counterfeited. It is this which compelled Mao to admit that contradictions exist in China.

To do otherwise, he says, would be to “fly in the face of reality.” That most certainly is true, and, as I pointed out in the last issue, “It is precisely which is the supreme manifestation of the class character of the Chinese regime.”

THE FETISHISM OF ONE-PARTY RULE

The fascists were the first openly to proclaim One-Party rule, but the Communists practiced that before the rise of Nazism. One learned from the other during the Depression which shook the world to its foundations. Thus, to win workers, the fascists named their philosophy “National Socialism.” The decree was only in the name, for no one could mistake the anti-Semitic, anti-semitic, anti-democratic Nazi writings for anything written by Karl Marx, the founder of modern socialism.

In the case of Russia and China, on the other hand, the whole State power is mobilized to proclaim the name and works of Marx in its Communist (more truly state capitalist) vice. That is to say, Communism tries to keep the theory of liberation known as Marxism imprisoned in its own perversion philosophy that State property equals socialism. In truth, it is the State property which has transformed what was once a working class party, the Communist Party, into its complete opposite, the One-Party State Power. Therein lies the whole corruption of Communism, that is to say, the fall exploitation of the working class by the totalitarian State power.

THE HAUNTED VASSAL OF STATE POWER

As a social type, the state capitalist individual who calls himself a Communist has one thing in common with the “self-styled spirits” that the great German philosopher, Hegel, described: it is his relationship to State-power. “Such a type is the haunted vassal,” wrote Hegel. “He is active in the interests of the state power,” and thus, completes the “inversion of reality and thought, their anti-life estrangement, the one from the other. . . . What is found out in this sphere is that neither the concrete realities, state-power and wealth, nor their determinate conceptions, good and bad, nor the consciousness of good and bad . . . possess real truth; it is found that all these moments are inverted and transmitted the one into the other, and each is the opposite of itself.”

This, dear reader who sees a difference between Stalin and Mao, includes both Mao and Stalin. The one thing both failed to see in “contradictions” in “each being the opposite of itself” is that it included them above all. For, just as the supreme manifestation of the capitalist law of value is the worker paid at minimum, so the supreme manifestation of totalitarianism is the One-Party rule. Mao or Stalin, fascist or Communist.—R.D.

August, 1957
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A Challenge and a Promise

(I have since received the following letter from a colleague of mine.)

I have just had one of the most exciting experiences of my life. I had the opportunity, some time ago, to read several draft chapters of Marxism and Freedom, and, as you already know, was tremendously impressed with them. But I have just read the complete manuscript, and I can hardly contain my excitement—so powerful is the impact of the book as a whole. (See: "What Kind of Work," page 1.)

COMMUNISM AS A WORLD-WIDE PHENOMENON

It is the most devastating exposure of Communism that I have ever read. I was greatly impressed with the chapters on Russia when I first read them. Even in preliminary draft, it was unmistakable that a mammoth job had been done in tracing the step-by-step transformation of Russia from the first workers' state in history into its very opposite—the most barbarous totalitarian regime of the modern world. But not until you have digested the book from beginning to end can you appreciate what a powerful weapon this work is in the fight against Communism, precisely because it does not let the reader go on thinking of Communism as only a "Russian phenomenon."

The warning that precedes it, from beginning to end, is that the state-capitalism of Russia—which culminated in Stalin's (and now Krushchev's) One-Party State—is in truth, a world-wide phenomenon: "Let no one think, because we took Russia as the supreme example, that America is exempt from this development."

WORKERS' DICTATOR

While Marx and Engels, the first "workers' dictator," may be an unfamiliar figure before reading this book, after reading he will be known in his fully developed form not only as the Stalinists, but even as the Reutgers and the Lewises. You recognize the Planners, one and all, and the "Planned Society" is seen to be precisely what Marx warned us about—so far back as 1848, in the prophetic words: "We should especially avoid establishing society as the basis of its measures to the individual. The individual is the social entity."

I cannot tell you how deeply moved I was to see just how simple and yet profound is the essence of M arxism—its deep Humanism—and to realize that all of history is nothing more nor less than the history of the struggle for freedom.

THE COMMON MAN'S ACTIVITY IS THE MOVING FORCE OF HISTORY

What struck me as the most profound theme in the work is the simple truth that it has indeed been the common man who has made all of history, and who has pushed the world forward at every critical moment. The minute you open the book, you are immersed in the dramatic description of the activity of the common people during the French Revolution, and the impact of that activity upon Hegel, the greatest of all philosophers. The making of Marx's own development becomes the exciting description of the Paris Commune, the American Civil War, and the struggle for the 8-Hour Day, and their impact on his philosophy.

The powerful history packed into the pages of Marxism and Freedom, rarely receives more than a line or two in standard history "texts." This alone would make the book an exciting experience. But it is not the history alone that makes the book so gripping. It is the proof, in that history, that there has never been an idea, even in the mind of a genius like Hegel or Marx, that was not first in the activity of the common man; and the warning that "whoever fails to recognize the limits of a theoretical work, although he may glorify theory and speculation, also, in actuality, fails to recognize the indispensibility of the theoretical."

A CHALLENGE TO EVERY INTELLECTUAL

This is the challenge to every intellectual today: "If, as a theoretician, one's ears are attuned to the new impulses from the work—"as new categories will be created and a new way of thinking, which at one and the same time is a step forward in philosophic cognition and a leap into freedom."

I cannot help but add that if your ears are not attuned, you have the pitiful helplessness that passes for "theory" today but is incapable of answering a single one of the critical problems the world faces—What do we need, or about Automation? About totalitarianism? About the N-bomb? It is no exaggeration to say that these questions must be answered if civilization itself is to survive.

The challenge is nothing more than to match in theory the activity our contemporary common man is writing into the history of our age. That is the history that left me the most breathless of all: From the Freedom Fighters in Hungary to the Montgomery boycotters in America, to the miners' strikes against Automation—you can almost feel the pulse of our age's struggle for freedom.

It is not enough to see the total image of the world the world faces. That everyone can see today. But to see, in the activity of your fellow-men, the affirmative answer to the question, "Can man be free?"—that is almost as much a new society already.

Consciously to be aware that you are standing on the threshold of the, the new, society, that you have a place on that threshold, that you are living in the birth-time of true freedom—that is an experience that defies description.

SEPTEMBER, 1957.
TWO WORLDS

Djilas' NEW CLASS

Milovan Djilas, former Vice-President of Yugoslavia, has written a journalistic piece on the Communist system from which he has broken. This has been put between the covers of a book and given a million dollars' worth of free publicity by the "free" capitalist press. Thereupon followed rave notices in all the papers and magazines, including the "leftist" press. It was climaxcd by LIFE magazine's claim that here is a book "that will rock Marxism." What astonishes us is not the presumptuousness of this claim, but the naivety of the journalists, book reviewers, editorial writers and State Department types thinking that believes this.

Here is a man who is a typical product of the Communist world—an alleged Marxist theoretician whose ignorance of Marxist theory is matched only by the enormity of the contradictions in his statements. Thus he claims that Marx "unintentionally" (our emphasis) laid the basis for a new conception of the world. Otherwise, says Djilas, Marxist philosophy was so threadbare that it "would have been forgotten—dismissed as something not particularly profound or even original"—if the political needs of the workingclass movement in Europe had not demanded a new ideology complete in itself. "That is how it happened that this philosophy which was not important since it was based mainly on Hegelian and materialistic ideas" became "the ideology of the new, oppressed classes and especially of political movements" and as such "it marked an epoch, first in Europe, and later in Russia and Asia, providing the basis for a new political movement and a new social system."

Having thus cleverly slipped in present-day Communist totalitarianism under the Marxist theory of liberation, Djilas feels that he might be called to account for this sleight of hand, so he says magnanimously, "There is no other type of Marxism or Communist thought, and the development of another type is hardly possible."

In this one-half of a sentence, that no other type of Marxism is possible, lies the whole secret for the success of the theory of Marxism. The question of whether the "Marxist" has put a seal of bankruptcy on its own thought. While hoping that the working people do not find Marxism in its original form or in any other form acceptable, what is it that Djilas is passing off as the needed philosophy in his book, The New Class? According to Djilas, there is "an immutable law—that each human society and all individual participants in it strive to increase and perfect production."

This immutable law, to "perfect production," has all terrifying for "the cause." At least it has Djilas so much in its grip that he even forbids his present Communist enemies for their tyranny at least up until now since there was no other way to industrialize the backward countries.

Marx had a better name for this "perfect production." It was "production for production's sake" which drove the capitalists on, and they rode the workers so that it all ended in the two most monstrous, concentration and centralization of capital at the one hand, and the degradation of the worker to a cog in the machine at the other.

"It is the fact that capital and its self-expansion," wrote Marx, "appears as the stirring and closing point as the motive and aim of production; that production is merely production for capital and not vice versa, the means of production more means for an ever expanding system of the life process for the benefit of the society of producers.

The end result of capitalist production is capitalist form, the form of production for the capitalist form now existing in Russia and Yugoslavia and calling itself Communist.

It is hard to believe that Djilas has chosen his book in order to expound the very philosophy which led to its ultimate form as Stalinist capitalism, and toward which the whole private capitalist world is moving. Djilas sheds very little light. The Communist tyranny has been analyzed long before he did it, and more seriously. He fails even to shed the light of experience on it. Indeed the one thing I did look for in this book—a live description of Top's Yugoslavia—is entirely absent.

What, then, prompted "the West" to give this threadbare book a spectacular send-off? We can see the answer not in what they say, but in the objective world situation. Little Rock, Ark., on the one hand, and the Spanish Civil War, on the other hand, have combined to expose the hollowness of American democracy and the Stalinist Marxism. If ever whirlwinds in the dark passed for a method of thought, this is it. Thereby "the West" itself has put the seal of bankruptcy on its own thought.

White hope that the working people do not find Marxism in its original form or in any other form acceptable, what is it that Djilas is passing off as the needed philosophy in his book The New Class? According to Djilas, there is "an immutable law—that each human society and all individual participants in it strive to increase and perfect production."

OCTOBER 1957

6626
EDITORIALS

Outer Space or Total War?

No sooner had President Eisenhower finished congratulating Russia upon her scientific achievement in being the first to launch a man-made moon into outer space, than he followed up with threats that America is still ahead in the missile field and will speed up that program further. The daily press also made sure that its praise of Russia was followed up with threats and with calculated means of striking terror into the hearts of the American people by visions of germ warfare from outer space. To calm the fears of "total war," that overly-political scientist, Edward Teller, tells us we should be conditioned for "non-total nuclear war," i.e., wipe out only one city and one regiment and be prepared for Russia to do the same to us.

Russia, on its part, is taking full advantage to claim "superiority" in getting to the moon as well as in creating inter-continental missiles, Khrushchev thunders: Western Europe had better know that it could be wiped off the face of the earth in less than 10 years if it does not live up to the present international situation.

This is both poles of world capital — Russia and America — rushing headlong into total war.

The Sputnik had hardly been in space for a day when proponents of the war profiteers began to stream out in the daily press. They shouted that the workers were "responsible" for the inflation, for the recession, for monopoly, for the fall in the stock market. And they warned that American workers better start to learn, at once, to live on a less "high" standard of living.

The labor bureaucracy at the same time, in the person of Walter Reuther, started to compete with the capitalists in statements about the need for "defense" production. What the workers in the factories want to know is: when will he start defending their interests and better conditions? In the shops? As most workers put it the day after the launching of the satellite, "All this means to us is higher taxes and more Automation."

The intellectuals, on the other hand, are so open-mouthed in their admiration for the Russian achievement that they are ready to whitewash all Russian claims of "superiority." They have always been prone to the Flan.

There is no reason whatever to panic before the alleged fact that Russia is "ahead" of America. Russian Plans were always based on the ever-greater expansion of machinery, and they early found that it is easier to produce a show subway, an H-bomb, and now the Sputnik, than to raise the standard of living of the Russian workers, or to solve the ever-constant crisis in agriculture.

American capitalists are equally efficient masters of sitting harder upon the workers, and now they are getting the Congressmen to railroad through a whole host of anti-labor legislation.

The Republicans in Congress are now trying to grab the limelight from the Democrats in smiting a new strike breaking law mis-named "Right to Work." The Republicans have a hard job there since at the head of the Democrats in this field sits headline-grabbing Sen. McGovern, who has for a long time now been using his expose of corruption in unions as the cover for a national "Right to Work."

This man of "law and order" is quick in his defiance of the Supreme Court decision on desegregation, quick to run to the defense of his fellow-Arkansan Democrat—that newly emergent face of Racism, Governor Faubus—and even quicker with statements against the Negro children for exercising their democratic rights.

So total is the crisis in the world and in this country, that it took but a few hours of a man-made satellite circling the earth to raise the curtain and show how Russia and America both are preparing for total war. To show that the labor-haters are also the Negro-haters. To show that the Republicans and Democrats alike are planning a total war against the workers' standard of living, and against the workers' present struggles for better conditions in this country. At the same time, the intellectuals showed how radiantness are our intellectuals, and how prostrate the labor bureaucracy.

The rank and file workers have not yet spoken. But already they are turning against not only total war, but the "non-total" nuclear war that the officious scientist, Edward Teller, is preaching. For the workers alone have both the vision and the power to establish a totally new society with totally new human relations, beginning with the point of production. That is where all decisions will be made.

---
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RUSSIA'S INTERNAL CRISIS

UNREST IN THE RUSSIAN ARMY

Russia's scientific achievement in launching the satellite has all but hidden the man-made crisis in Russia—in agriculture, in industry, among the youth and especially in the Red Army where a Russian marshal gets 144 times more pay than a private. (In the American Army a 5-star general gets about 15 times more pay than a private).

Nevertheless, during World War II the Red Army soldiers flocked into the Communist Party, and were encouraged to do so. When they reached the capitol West—even such backward areas as Norway—the soldiers were surprised to learn of the standard of living and plenty of consumer goods as compared to Russia. They showed their dissatisfaction with the Communist Party and immediately the latter retaliated with a vicious campaign against "bourgeois deviations" in the Army. That was in Stalin's time.

In Khrushchev's time, the recklessness of the de-mobilized Red Army men—particularly those who had been on occupation duty—was such that he sent thousands of them, by regiments and divisions, into the wilderness of Siberia in his attempt to transform that arid land into a new bread basket to compete with the Ukraine. This year, Khrushchev had to admit that the drought has led to a decrease in the harvest. As for the Red Army men that were sent to put down the Hungarian revolutionaries and themselves to please either Khrushchev or Zhukov.

In a word, it wasn't Zhukov's non-acceptance of the Party's leadership but the rank and file soldier's non-acceptance of the Party leadership that led to the Khrushchev's dismissal. Making him a scapegoat gave notice to the Army that the Communist Party will not tolerate any revolt.

THE REBELLIOUSNESS OF THE RUSSIAN PEASANTS AND WORKERS

No one's memory is shorter than that of our "Russian experts." One would think that because the scientific achievement of the man-made moon signifies the achievement also of intercontinental missiles that, thereby, all the Russian claims of industrial superiority are justified. Yet, it was only recently that the Russians openly reported that they had to scrap the Ninth Five Year Plan launched with so much hull-hum at their 20th Congress.

That plan was based on nothing short of a 100 per cent rise in agricultural productivity, and a 25 per cent rise in labor productivity in industry. Since then, the result in the countryside has been so great that they have returned to a good deal of private capitalist incentives, abolished the agricultural taxes to the State, from private plots, and launched an unsuccessful campaign to get the farmer into the Communist Party.

The scrapping of the Sixth Five Year Plan was not done lightly. It was the rebelliousness of the Russian workers which compelled this. The Russian leadership had to (1) pass a minimum wage law; (2) reduce the work week by 2 hours and promise a 7 hour day by 1960; and (3) promise that with the new Fifteen Year Plan which will soon be instituted, first consideration will be given to housing, in 19 or 15 years Khrushchev thought.

THE REVOLT OF THE RUSSIAN YOUTH

Finally, these are the Russian youth who have been reared in Khrushchev's Communist and want none of it. The Russian papers are full of stories about "hoodlums," delinquent youth and delinquent parents. They are now discussing the new law for exiling "parasites.

In the 4th year of its existence, the monotony they dare call a "workers' state" is passing a law "On Measures for Intensifying the Struggle Against Anti-Social Parastites (Parasites)—"able-bodied citizens who are deliberately avoiding socially useful work and engaging in vagrancy.

No country in the world has more laws designed to force the youth to labor, military service, ideological conformity. The State Labor Reserve draft youth into labor schools and then force them to work where the State sends them "at prevailing rates of wages." Thus, when Khrushchev decided on his scheme "to transform" the Urals, 150,000 youth were sent out there. There is, besides, compulsory universal military service, and of course, there is "the Party" or rather the youth leagues. Nevertheless, they have run out of words of abuse against the youth, and now have invented a new word for those they call "cynical, bored youth." It is Nihobisches—neither God nor devil.

The nihilobisches, plus the workers, plus the peasants, plus the Red Army soldiers, make up the majority of the Russian people who are in continuous revolt against the One Party Totalitarian State. But we have our eyes turned skyward and fail to see this great human force for freedom.

NOVEMBER, 1957
TWO WORLDS

An American in Paris

One of my colleagues has written the following:

"A friend of mine returned from Europe last month and told me about an old college mate of ours. Let’s call him Joe. Since Little Rock and Sputnik I, he wanders unhappily around Paris on the verge of a breakdown. He is stunned by the polite snubs he now receives in circles where, until recently, he was a welcome guest. Even his American friends have begun to avoid him because he keeps begging them to help him decide whether to return to the United States for psychoanalysis. He’s terrified that war will cut his “career” short if he begins it in Europe.

BIography of an intellectual hack

"Joe was a bright pupil in grammar school. He entered high school in 1932, a terrible year for the family. That year, his father didn’t work at all and finally had to go on relief for several months. But nothing was allowed to interfere with Joe’s education. He was an honor student in high school, where he was attracted to the Young Communist League, although he never joined.

"Joe entered the College of the City of New York in 1933. That was also the year when the murderous Moscow Trials shocked the world and marked the beginning of his opposition to Communists as the enemy of democracy. He thereafter drifted to the anti-Communist radical youth at City College.

"He was preoccupied with the problem of poverty and unemployment in this land of plenty. He worked out all kinds of plans for the national organization of wealth so there would be plenty for all. He opposed private capitalism in the United States and American imperialism abroad. He detested the AFL craft unions and argued passionately for the organization of the reluctant, oppressed, unskilled workers in the new CIO. He decided then that he would be a writer or educator for the working class.

"He attended meetings of the Trotskyist, Socialist and Loveamericana youth. All showered him with great attention, hoping to recruit him, but he never joined. He said he was all on certain points and disagreed with all the others. In this climate, Joe’s sympathy for the working class reached its highest point.

The lure of contacts

"He graduated with honors in 1940 and got a civil service job as a clerk in Washington, D.C. For the first time in his life he actually met a number of political, labor and literary personalities. He decided that contacts were essential to his career.

"Shortly after he was drafted, in 1942, he was assigned with the aid of a contact—to a research project. Except for his uniform, which he enjoyed wearing, his life continued in its usual pattern. After V-E Day, he longed for the excitement of Europe and wangled himself an administrative assignment in France, where he learned to speak French fluently. The world was his, until he was discharged late in 1945 and had to return home and find a job. Radicalism, he decided, was fine for a young student, but it trained him in disciplined activity. But an adult had to be realistic. Anyway, the common man no longer figured in his mind as a positive force in today’s streamlined cold-war world. Only the liberal-minded public figure, he argued boldly, could engineer deals to ease the crisis. Irresponsible actions, like wildcats, angered him as the sure way to throw the country into the arms of the reactionaries or the Communists.

Death of a salesman

"He became a busy little public relations man for national liberal groups, and he met all the big shots. With the Korean War he maneuvered himself into another overseas assignment, again in France, where he felt most at home and where he had lived since.

"Through the blessings of the State Department, and the direct and indirect support of the Ford Foundation and the AFL, he established himself as a social lion in the intellectual circles of Paris with frequent trips to England, Germany, Italy and Austria as well.

"He indignantly denounces Russia’s barbarous suppression of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters. The European intellectuals agree and point angrily to America’s failure to help them; and then, in horror, they point to Little Rock in decision, to Sputnik; and in fact, to Russia’s IRBM. Joe has nothing to sell except an anti-Communism that is hardly better than Communism, and he’s caught in the cross-fire with no place to hide.

December, 1957
TWO WORLDS

Dr. Von Braun, Hitler's V-2 rocket chief and presently America's missile expert, found it necessary to lecture to the American people upon the fact that the successful launching of an American satellite into outer space should not act as "a positive to pull us back into complacency."

It was not complacency, however, which tempered American enthusiasm over the Explorer's being in orbit. What tempered the enthusiasm was the sober realization of the total destructiveness of the weapons now in the hands of both America and Russia. It is sufficient to wipe civilization as we have known it off the face of the earth. The relief expressed when Russia broke the American monopoly of the atom bomb in 1949 was not repeated when America broke Russia's monopoly of outer space in 1958 because the illusion is now gone that the world powers both having the same weapons will produce a stalemate. No one now thinks that ICBM's and IRBM's are "deterrents" to war.

POINT OF NO RETURN

Point of no return is the spuntik, but the complete bankruptcy of thought on both sides of the Iron Curtain which leads to such total reliance on weapons of war. Nothing makes this so clear as the attitude to the youth's rebellious spirit, desire for peace, and quest for a totally new way of life.

While the American military were urging the scientists to "catch up" with the spuntik, the Russian people were becoming so active in the factories, on the countryside, and in the classroom, that the totalitarian rulers, at one and the same time, tried to appease them and continue to terrify the youth.

RUSSIAN YOUTH IN REVOLT

On the one hand, the Kremlin bureaucracy is putting new laws against "sabotage," "boiliganism," and "milislism" (riot, spirit of rebellion). On the other hand, these same monolithic bureaucrats are trying the kid glove approach to alleged deviations on the cultural front. Recently they decided to "reorganize" the magazine of the youth movement, Kommunel (Young Guard). That is to say, they fired the editors and put the youth organ under strict Party discipline. It was not Pravda that led the attack, but the Literaturnaya Gazeta (literary journal).

The attack on "milislitism" among the youth had all the same marks of the 1948 Stalinist attack on "cosmopolitans." Behind each lurked anti-Semitism. On more precisely, the attempts to get a foothold in Arab Middle-East, which, in the preparations for World War III is playing the same role that the Balkans played for World War I.

Anti-Semitism appears also in the suddenly unleashed campaign against Howard Fast, the American writer, who maliciously followed the Communist Party line for two decades, but who last year broke with it. Literaturnaya Gazeta now claims that "in essence" Fast "had never been a member of the Party," that his break with Communism was due to his wanting to make peace with American imperialism and "America's love of Israel."

It is not Fast's alleged Zionism that at the root of the Russian attack on him. The truth is that the student youth, like the working class youth, is very realistic. While Russia used to good propaganda advantage the fact that the American State Department did not wish to grant American youth the right to travel in China, Russia itself never lets Russian youth travel anywhere freely. Despite that, the outlook of Russian youth is not narrowly Russian but is concerned with world problems. It is this which they want to channelize into concern with the Middle East. Their Arab calling card is anti-Israel. Into this they now wish to throw youth, coupling it with attacks on American writers who have broken with Communism and all the while calling loudly for a summit conference "for peace."

BACK TO THE SPUNTIK AND WAR

The Ruskies know that Israel is a fact whereas Zionism is an ideology which many Jews do not follow. Indeed, the biggest party in Israel is the Mapu, a sort of labor socialist party. The pretense, that anyone, including American writers, is a "Zionist" and a "militant one" as American writers is a "Zionist" and a "militant one" as American writers is a "Zionist" and a "militant one" as American writers is a "Zionist" and a "militant one" as American writers is a "Zionist" and a "militant one"

Zionism is on the rise in the Arab countries. The choice of war as the way out of full-scale depression, even as the Russian people fear that their own "madmen" will be the first to press that war button.

On both sides of the Iron Curtain, the real question that preoccupies the people in now that the scuttik has an American fellow-traveler in outer space, what happens to the struggle of the people on this earth for a new way of life free from exploitation and discrimination? - R.D.
TWO WORLDS

UNEMPLOYMENT AND ORGANIZATIONS TO FIGHT IT

The present unemployment situation has everyone from Eisenhower to the Sunday preacher talking about it. But no one is doing anything about it. A look at the organizational forms which the last depression produced may have some value for us today. If only to reject the old forms and create entirely new ones. It is for this reason that I am turning the pages of history back to the 1930's.

The last depression gave rise to a number of small political parties, the chief of which was the American Workers Party (AWP), officially formed in 1933. Actually, it had existed from 1928 when it was called the Conference for Progressive Labor Action (CPLA). It was formed originally to defend Brooklyn Labor College from attacks by the AA of L that the college was harboring Communists. The actual reason for the attack was that the college taught industrial anarcho-syndicalism. The chairman of the college, the CPLA and the AWP was A. J. Muste.

In 1931, they launched the great organizing strike in Paterson, N.J. They were in the forefront of the campaign to organize the West Virginia Mine Workers Union as well as the Illinois miners in 1932. They soon found themselves at the head of some 10,000 unemployed in the Midwest. They organized Unemployed Leagues in opposition to the Unemployed Councils organized by the Communist Party.

In 1934 a strike against Auto-Line broke out in Toledo, Ohio. An AF of L local called the strike, but it soon became obvious it was impossible for it alone to fight all the forces of capital and the police arrayed against it. The local called upon the Musteite Unemployed League for help in the picket line. When the organizing talent of the Musteites was added to the tremendous activity of the workers, Toledo, Ohio, became the birthplace of the auto workers union. Thus the Musteites were in the forefront of what became later the mighty upsurge of labor called the CIO.

THE "AMERICAN ORIENTATION" AND POLITICAL ACTION

But already in 1933 they had come to the conclusion that neither the struggles of the unemployed for relief nor those of the workers for industrial unionism would be sufficient to change the world crisis into a workers world. Political action was needed. At the AWP founding convention in Pittsburgh, resolutions called for the formation of a genuine mass labor party, "an American orientation." Putting in the opposite direction was Louis Budenz who was looking at the Communist Party with its daily paper, posts and branches all over the country—Russia. Before that force the "American orientation" crumbled.

WHAT TO TELL THE WORKERS

There is no doubt that those intellectuals had turned to the working class because they believed that the capitalists had led the world from world war to world depression, and that only the workers could change society fundamentally. The difficulty was that the task for them as intellectuals did not end with their turning to the working class. It first began there.

What, between Fascism, Communism and the New Deal, would the intellectuals of the "American orientation" tell the workers?

The situation was a concrete one: in the unemployed leagues and in the strikes one strong force (the Communist Party) and one small force (the Trotskyists) were pulling at the Musteites. The ranks were hungry for ideas. They were attracted to the Trotskyists who seemed to have a body of ideas from the present and a potential for world revolution and who were saying to the Musteites, "You went down before fascism without a fight. It is because your leader, Stalin, subordinates all struggles to the dictates of the emerging Russian bureaucracy. Only we stand for true workers interests on a world scale."

After the merger with the Trotskyists the ranks were the first to drop out. Trotskyism was completely isolated from the great upsurge that became the CIO.

COMMUNISM, TROTSKYISM, WHAT NOW

Part of the Musteite leadership, represented by Budenz, joined the Communist Party where he became the managing editor of the Daily Worker. He has now become the chief Stalinist pigeon.

Muste himself dropped out of the movement soon after the merger of his group with the Trotskyists. He now heads the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a pacifist grouping. Burnham broke with Trotskyism during the war. He saw a new society emerging, not from the workers, but from managers and planners. He is now the outspoken campaigner for "all-out Americanism." Sidney Hook is the advocate of "democracy" for all those who agree with him. It is hard to distinguish between him and Attorney General William P. Rogers.

The unemployment situation and the crisis it will bring will certainly throw up groups of radicals who more than ever will need a system of ideas which will enable them not merely to agitate for the unemployed and take part in the workers' struggles, but will help them to meet the crisis. The time to do that is now. Every page of NEWS & LETTERS is engaged in this task.

R. D.
TWO WORLDS

One-Half Hour From Total Destruction

Dr. W. H. Pickering, director of California Institute of Technology and responsible for the successful launching of the Explorer, warns that mankind is 30 minutes from total destruction: "We are surely in need of some principle that will save mankind from mutual annihilation... We can't find it by building anti-missiles to shoot down other nations. We need a unifying principle. I don't know just where we will find it, but find it we must."

This awareness of living one-half hour away from total destruction permeates the young generation as well as the older one, with this very fundamental difference—instead of retracing to the lady tower that now builds these destructive weapons, college youth are turning toward the Marxist theory of liberation which would unify mental and manual work in a totally new way of life. This became especially clear to me in the tour of a West Coast college where I spoke on MARXISM AND FREEDOM.

COLLEGE YOUTH TURN OUT TO HEAR LECTURES ON MARXISM AND FREEDOM

The first thing that was outstanding about the present tour, as contrasted to a tour a year ago before publication of MARXISM AND FREEDOM, was the attendance. Where, before, the usual attendance was 25-50, this time each appearance brought out between 100 to 200 and, in one case, over 500. Where, before, the audience was mainly a captive one—that is to say, it was the regular session of some economics, sociology or philosophy class—this time the audience was voluntary. No credit was given for attendance and the meetings were generally held either at noon time or at 4 p.m., that is to say, at the end of the school day. In one case, in San Francisco, the meeting was held in the evening and this brought out an adult audience, with a goodly number of workers, longshoremen, among them. In addition to the total of 2,000 students that heard me, many more thousands saw and heard me on radio and TV.

The second significant feature of the present tour was the urgency of the questions, as contrasted to the academic nature of the questions a year ago. For example in a lecture on "The Present Trends in the Russian Economy," I spoke about the fact that the Russian people themselves would overthrow Communism. I was then asked whether the Russian people, especially the youth, would follow "the West." I said that I doubted that because they wouldn't be overthrowing Communism, which is just another name for state-capitalism, in order to get back to private capitalism which brought this world crisis about.

In another lecture on "The American Roots of Marxism," I was asked why was the least known part of Marxism; its American heritage. "Is it because our educational system does not teach us all that we should know about our own history?" When I replied that from the days of the Abolitionists through the CIO to the present wildcats on Automation American humanism has moved in a direction that parallelized that of Marxist thought, when he lived and even now, I was asked whether I considered Marx had the answer to today's Automation when he pointed out that it was not the machine which shortened the working day "but the struggle of the workingmen."

WORKER AND INTELLECTUAL

The question that kept cropping up, whether the talk was on Russia or America or the programs or both for the so-called under-developed countries, was how could the intellectuals help workers when the lives of one and the other are so different and why should they "give up" their mental work, which is so much more interesting than that of manual laborers. When I asked if they were satisfied with the fact that their intellectual work had brought about the I.C.I.E.E. but not the unifying principle, that could win the global struggle for the mind of man, some one asked, could science have developed differently if, instead of development for war purposes, science could be developed alongside the struggles of the workingmen for a different society?...

There is no doubt that the hardest thing for intellectuals to comprehend is that the impetus for a new society comes from the workers and not from themselves. That intellectuals aren't "giving up" anything except their own fragmentation when they associate with workers, and that they, as well as workers, must meet the challenge of the times: When civilization as we have known it is but 30 minutes away from annihilation, it is not the time to think that 1958 would be a turning point in history where history would fall to turn. This is a fatal illusion that is not shared by the great majority of the American youth.

April 30, 1958
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TWO WORLDS

WHITHER PARIS?

by RAYA BUNAYEVA

EXISTENTIALIST INTELLECTUALS HELP TIGHTEN THE COMMUNIST STRANGLEHOLD

A key role in this will be played by the French intellectuals. The most influential of these are the Existentialists who have been willing victims of the Communists who have their feet "to engage" or "demonstrations" from any activity in the mass movement by taking over all "responsible leadership." 1948 witnessed the first breakaway of a part of the French proletariat from the Communist Party. Existentialists offered to lead it—and led it right back to Communism. The most prominent Existentialist apologists for Communism, Jean-Paul Sartre, did break away during the brutal Communist suppression of the Hungarian Revolution, but he is now back in some "popular front against Fascism." Why?

It is not out of any confusion between Marxism and Communism. Nor is it necessarily for lack of bravery. No. The huckstering these intellectuals have undergone is due to the simple fact that intellectuals, for removed from the discipline of the party and the class struggle, are affected with an irresistible malady: the concept that workers are "backward," must be "taught," must be "led." They are totally blind to the fact that the greatest obstacle in the way of the workers' establishing a totally new society, new human relations, is precisely the established self-styled Marxist parties like the Communist, Socialist, and Labor Party.

TASK OF THE INTELLECTUAL

Where Marx removed theory from a dispute among intellectuals and made it into a weapon in the class struggle, and while intellectuals reduce theory to a word game reserved for intellectuals. Where the Existentialist party to break away from Communist, the Marxist intellectual let it suffice for lack of any comprehensive revolutionary theory with which to combat Communism. Where they plan for the workers, they nevertheless did nothing to face their intellectual responsibility, to put an end to the intellectual strife that has accumulated in the Marxist movement. Despite all protestations to the contrary, small theoretical groupings who did see Communism as the only state-capitalist tyranny it is, did nothing to re-establish Communism in its original form of a new Humanism. It is high time for a serious reappraisal.
France at the Cross Roads

PARISIAN WORKERS DEMONSTRATE AND WAIT

In Paris against De Gaulle's coming to power. The overwork, the French people are being sick of the bourgeoisie, talking-shop, empty professions of opposition to the dictator-general De Gaulle they demand.

One New York Times reporter in Paris asked a cab driver why he was not in this mass demonstration. He said, "I doubt that De Gaulle will do anything more than any other politician to get France out of its mess, but he wouldn't fight against me.

But, he added, "I'll tell you what I'll fight for: my personal liberties, food for my family; if they try to take them away from me, I'll fight."

DE GAULLE AND BIG BUSINESS

"They" soon will make more sharply to labor that away from him. That is why De Gaulle is pushed into power. He was pushed, not because he didn't want power, but because he wasn't strong enough to get there on his own. That is to say, he had no mass base.

His attempt at building a fascist movement collapsed, and by 1951, he himself had "retired" from politics, playing a watching and conspiratorial role with the military. The big brass are the ones who pushed De Gaulle into power, but they too couldn't have done so without the mass backing of big capital.

De Gaulle is, first of all, the "choice" of big business, which has undergone a restructuring and has achieved a tremendous rate of growth in the last few years. Although they cannot yet match Great Britain or West Germany, much less Britain and America, they feel strong enough to get rid of the plague of the French economy — the small shopkeeper, the small grower, the petty bourgeois, in fact, who has kept France in the small leagues ever since the end of the First World War.

Big Capital would like to exploit labor too in a "new way. They have learned from Russian state capitalism the advantages of the trade union as a part of the state apparatus. If a "strong man" cannot achieve for them what the labor bureaucracy has achieved under state capitalism — doing the disciplining of labor for capital — they would be willing to recognize the "rights of the workers" to such unions.

That is why they are not yet showing their hand to labor. They dream of shaking labor with as little effort as it took to get the labor cooperation of such "socialists" as Guy Mollet and Lacoste.

In this dream world of capital, they have forgotten only one thing: Mollet and Lacoste, no matter what label they pin on themselves, have as much influence on labor as capital itself: none. It is not what has unfolded in France thus far, but what will unfold in the next stage, that will be decisive for France.

Meanwhile, big business feels it is now, and for all, gets rid of all the many petty bourgeois representatives in parliament, it could once again become a Big Power.

In a word, Big Business now has no use whatsoever for the bourgeois parliament as an instrument of capital. It wants, instead, a "Strong Man" to create the conditions for it to rule, and to bring back its past imperial glory. Because this is what it wants, it cooperated with the military to bring De Gaulle to power.

There are those who are eager to condemn the French workers for their "passivity" at the fall of the republic. Yet these critics themselves played a passive role in the four years since the Algerian massacres were carried on their heroic struggles for independence.

REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN ALGERIA

The French junta in Algeria plotted this coup with the large French landowners who have kept Algeria in subjection for over a century.

Their "civilizing mission" consisted in putting down ruthlessly every revolt for freedom of the native Algerians; in not industrializing the land although they have had a century in which to do it; in living in wretched luxury on their huge plantations, while they keep the pay of an agricultural worker down to a miserable 50 a day.

The average family this worker must support with this "pay" is 7 to 8 people.

It is against this type of economic exploitation, as well as political disfranchisement that the native Algerian population — they number 2 million while the French colonists number only 1 million — have been in continuous revolt throughout the 19th century as well as in the 20th century. Four years ago the Algerians' revolt took a new and organized shape in their demands for national liberation from French imperial rule.

So elemental has been the struggle of these native Algerian revolutionaries, and so just their demands, that even the American Administration — which has supported French imperial rule all the way from Indo-China to Africa — has put condition on its "Generosity." The French government was to negotiate some sort of limited freedom for the Algerian population.

The French government — Galland's under then— was about to enter into such negotiations when the Algerian "terrorist-revolutionaries" decided to turn their guns against...
the motherland. They are the ones who brought about the fall of the Fourth French Republic. Now that the republic lies prostrate, they are suddenly filled with love for "France."

Whatever fury there is in De Gaulle's proposal that these counter-revolutionaries give the native Algerians "political equality," the truth is that the overwhelming majority of the Algerians want, not union with France, but independence from France. Shortly after De Gaulle delivered his speech in Algiers, a group of Algerian youth drove through the square, shouting, "Frenchmen, to the gallows!" The unceasing fight for independence goes on.

AMERICA AND RUSSIA AGAINST THE FRENCH WORKERS

Whether De Gaulle will long remain in power, or whether he is only the middleman for the Fascist paramilitars and their "civilian" allies — the landowners who are armed to the teeth — is not the decisive question. The decisive question is: What will the French proletariat do?

Fear of what the French workers will do impelled Algeria and Russia to make a 180° turn in their policies. The first step so far was the American Administration. Without bothering to cover their tracks, the immediately announced that he is one of those who "likes De Gaulle." So cheap are the principles of the Administration that the most quixotically forgotten man is Murphy, Ike's special representative who had made a mild attempt to quell France's desire to grant Algeria a measure of independence.

Instead, everyone suddenly found that though De Gaulle demanded and got dictatorial powers, he is "really" a democrat. Not only a democrat in general, but one who wants to mold the French Constitution on the American model and "stop" (1) the civil war. Never mind that he has instigated a civil war — so long as it was against workers' power.

Not far behind in wooing De Gaulle is Russia. Enich, U.S. and Russia, is trying to get his ear and enlist him in the "greater" struggle for world power. That is what De Gaulle is aiming at when he speaks of the "grandeur" of France. He aims to become the balance of power between these two great giants for world domination.

THE HUMAN SOLUTION

There is no doubt that the rise of De Gaulle means the French workers have lost the first round. Nor is there doubt that when their "personal liberties and food" are encroached upon — as must happen when De Gaulle moved to consolidate power — the workers will fight. And they will fight, not only defensively, but for a totally new way of life free from all exploitation at home and abroad.

The one element that the French crisis, correctly focused on in this: in the final analysis it is the human element that will decide the course of history. Neither the launching of satellites into outer space, nor the hurling of missiles across continents can solve the problems of this earth.

The revolution of the Algerian masses for national independence showed that there is only way out. The counter-revolution is trying to stop the clock of history with unspeakable tortures for the Algerian population and with arms that it uses equally against the Algerians and "the motherland, France." The French workers have not yet had their last say that will decide the true course of history.
RESPONSIBILITY OF INTELLECTUALS

By RAYA DENAYEVSAYA, author of MARXISM AND FREEDOM

I have received several letters from friends abroad who ask me to clarify the last paragraph in my previous column on the question of "the responsibility of the Marxist theorist." In questioning my analysis of What's News?, these critics say: "Having, ever since the beginning of the French crisis, issued the slogan 'Neither Primo nor De Gaulle' what else can a Marxist theorist do except try to appeal to workers to establish their own councils and take power? Surely, my correspondents concluded, 'it is not the intellectuals, but the workers, who have the power to change society.'

This is true, but it is not the whole truth. Were Marxism alive and Marxism that was a great truth, there would be no reason for it to have continued as a movement after 1848. The fact that Marxism is alive still is now only because it is incorporated in books, because it is in the daily lives and aspirations of the working people, and will remain so until a new truly human society is achieved. It will be achieved only when a new unity of theory and practice in the tradition of Marx but answering today's needs is achieved.

Now that Russia has become a state capitalist society, the unity of theory and practice which made possible, first, the Paris Commune, and then the early workers' state in Russia, evidently must be broadened to answer new questions and new tasks posed by today's workers: "What happens AFTER gaining of power? Will the division between mental and manual labor continue and thus forever confront us with a new bureaucracy—an intellectual elite?"

The theoreticians cannot pretend that they have discovered all solutions to these problems, but they have learned the grandeur of the activity of the masses who (1) have moved ahead from the period of the Russian Revolution where their primary aim was political power through soviet to the Spanish Revolution where they sought control of factories. In a word, they combined economic emancipation with self-rule. This has reached its highest development in the Workers Councils in Hungary, (2) Where, before Automation, the worker's control of production seemed to answer all questions, with Automation workers' control of production is incomplete unless it includes the beginnings of the end of the division between mental and manual labor.

Far from accepting his responsibility, the Marxist theoretician nowadays wants to shift all responsibility to the workers except that of leadership, if that is not to do.

BACK TO FRANCE

Take the present situation in France which was the subject of my last column. Of course only the French proletariat can work out the new forms of revolt against the new form of fascism. But two factors now stifle the workers: (1) The "ordinary" French intellectual who thinks that, because De Gaulle isn't Hitler, therefore the "republican form of government" will continue and worker and intellectual alike will have their "deocracy." (2) The intellectuals who have no such illusions—Communists and genuine Marxists alike—and pretend that they were right all the time, predicting such "bourgeoisism" as the logical outcome of capitalism.

I am not concerned with the Communist who will sing in tune Moscow blares out. I am concerned with the man who supports the Marxist leading his life. For, in the counter-revolution, the new form of fascism could not have been foreseen and was not foretold, much less prepared for by any other kind of the banner of Marxist Communism. Marx unfurled his not alone against capitalism, but against the vulgar Communists who thought they needed to do to have a new society was to oppose private property and all other questions would solve themselves.

A NEW LISTENING AND A NEW DOING

Freemasonry, while capitalism in France is learning to imitate not the outright destruction of unions, as in Nazi Germany, but, instead, to try to emulate successful Russian state capitalism and incorporate the trade unions, in one form or another, into the state apparatus, the Marxist theoretician is working with old, outdated categories. For example, every existing institution, including the British shop stewards, has undergone a transformation into opposition, and become an integral part of capitalism. Needed, therefore, are not only new forms of workers' revolt, which workers are sure to discover, but a new listening to workers. A new listening is needed plus (1) a demonstration of the theoretician's belief in the ability of the proletariat to do tasks hereforethought the prerogatives of leadership. In his own organization, therefore, the theoretician should "give up" editorship of publications in general, and the newspaper in particular. (2) On the basis of the new listening by him and the new doing by the proletariat, the theoretician can create a philosophy which the proletariat recognizes as the new quality of his own thoughts and aspirations for total freedom, freedom from economic exploitation and from political rule by a new intellectual elite. In a word, freedom to reconstruct the wholeness of man.

This unity of mental and manual labor in the worker himself, is to be removed from mere intellectual discussion among intellectuals, and instead made "the order of the day." In the reamer in which Marx considered the full and free development of the individual's power, of his natural and acquired talents, not as the "thereafter," but as the road to be taken on the narrow of capitulated industrial life, if the nationalized means of production are to serve any better than the privately owned means of production. Without unearthing such a human as a first step to the true social order, why should workers listen to Marxist theoreticians any more than they do to their own living bureaucrats?

AUGUST, 1958
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COLONIAL REVOLTS
AND THE CREATIVITY OF PEOPLE

by Nga Puuaydys
author of MARXISM AND FREEDOM

The cold war between America and Russia that began so soon as the hot war came to a halt is proof enough of the fact that World War II had not solved a single fundamental problem that capitalism, private or state, is constantly creating, and for which it is plaguing humanity into constant wars. At the same time, the colonial revolts that followed World War II differed sharply from those that followed World War I.

The colonial struggles that arose after World War I were inspired by the Russian Revolution of 1917 and followed the path of national liberation that linked itself to the working class struggles for a totally new social order, as witness the Chinese Revolution of 1919, led by Sun Yat Sen. On the other hand, the colonial struggles that followed World War II, and the division of world power into two colonial masses of capital, held either by America or Russia, have followed the path of compromise with the old social order.

THE ROLE OF THE ARMY AND THE COMPROMISE WITH THE OLD ORDER

Whether, as in Egypt, it was a compromise with the feudal social structure; or whether, as in Mao’s China, it skipped straight to forced collectivization and industrialization in a Russia, what characterized both colonial struggles is what characterizes our whole age: the role of the State.

The greatest single feature of a class state is its Army. Whether it is only secondary army colonies, like Nasser, who achieved power through a quick coup, or General Man, whose famous Eighth Route Army won only after literally decades of civil war, the truth is that the popular revolts in these were controlled by the Army. Never for any length of time have the untapped creative energies of the millions been brought to the benefit of the common man, as they were in the first years of the Russian Revolution.

The reason for the destruction of the old corrupt regimes of a Pasha or a Chiang has not led to a new life for millions. 500 million in China continue to be bottled up in contradictions, as Mao himself has had to admit. What then, is it that gives Mao’s China so much the appearance of “the new”?

The new seems “obvious.” It was not the native bourgeois, as in India, that led the national struggle and achieved national independence. It was the Communist Party. True, it is not a workers’ party. True, the petty bourgeoisie intellectuals that lead this party rely not on the masses, but on the Army. Indeed, the Chinese Constitution gives it equal status with “the Party.”

Still, because Mao’s obvious adversary is the corrupt Chiang who was driven from his country, despite the support both by Roosevelt and Stalin, the real opponents of Mao—the working people of China—are forgotten, and the illusion is created in many that Mao is “the progressive force” and should be supported in any “localized war.” As if in this age of state capitalism and nuclear warfare any war can be “localized” or it is the task of Marxism to take sides in such war? At the present moment this would be the height of folly and would doom the proletarian struggle.

The truth is that which appears as a new social order is only a new stage of—capitalism, state capitalism. Just as in World War I when the labor bureaucracy, whether in trade unions or parties, proved to be an integral part of capitalism, so in World War II the role of the petty bourgeoisie intellectuals has changed. He has transferred his individualism into “collectivism”—the State Plan. One thing remains the same: it is the State Plan against the workers’ revolution.

Plan or no plan, so decadent is capitalism and in total is its crisis precisely because each country has the two worlds of capitalism and workers, and yet the whole world divided into two but parts (See EDITORIAL) that it has not the forces nor the means nor the method to undertake the completion of the agricultural revolution or even the relief of tens of millions, much less the construction of modern industrial structures in underdeveloped countries. Neither Russia nor America has been able to help build the Anti-War Army for Egypt. In this day and age India is once again facing famines in large areas. So in China:

NOT MAO BUT THE CREATIVE UNTAPPED ENERGIES OF MILLIONS

The idea that Mao and his bureaucrats will lead China to a truly new human order is sheer fantasy. Historic viability China doesn’t have. Every partial solution to a problem only multiplies its contradictions and brings closer the day of World War III. That is its only “historical” future.

The only possible progress among a billion people in Asia and the awakened millions in Africa will come from the creative untapped energies of these billions. No military might will decide the question. The question that has been posed by the colonial revolutions is the creativity, the self-activity of the peoples themselves. Nothing on earth will prevent this solution from winning in the end.
EDITORIALS

OIL FOR THE BOMBERS OF WORLD WAR III?

"What are our troops doing in the Middle East anyway?" a Negro auto worker who is a Korean veteran wrote NEWS & LETTERS. "In Korea we were told that South Korea had been attacked and we came to its defense. What is the excuse now? Every time two colored people get into an argument, up pop the heads of Eisenhower and Khrushchev. It looks to me as if America and Russia want to gobble up the whole world between them."

Nothing that has come out of the mouths of the Administration or the learned apologists for landing troops in Lebanon comes up to the profundity of analysis of the worker quoted above. Unfortunately, however, it is not he who has the power to direct policy, but that brind of war strategists, John Foster Dulles, who is now helping Eisenhower elaborate a new theory called "indirect subversion."

"INDIRECT SUBVERSION"

There is no doubt that Russia is fishing in troubled waters at the summit and out of it. There also is no doubt that Nasser stands as the symbol of Arab nationalism. If he cannot free Egypt from its feudal fetters, he can at least thumb his nose at America—as he has just done when he showed up 6 hours late for a conference with President Eisenhower's "personal representative" Robert Murphy and left him holding the diplomatic pouch.

The truth is that this explosive game of politics this side of war is a result of the conspiracy among all the powers against the tide of liberation that is rising not only against the two main world power blocs, but for a new way of life altogether.

AND DIRECT LANDING OF TROOPS

Nasser can use Israel as the scapegoat for his failure to reconstruct Egyptian society on non-exploitative foundations because: (1) America and Russia and France and Britain and Turkey like to pretend that there was no Middle East problem before the creation of Israel in 1948. That "clears" them of centuries of exploitation of the Middle East long before Israel became a state. (2) Israel, like any state capitalist country, has acted with such utter disregard for the lives of the refugees from Palestine which had been their homeland before they were huddled into camps in Jordan that it needs no prod- ding from Radio Egypt to rouse them against Hussein as well as Israel.

HATRED AGAINST AMERICAN DOMINATION

(3) As in Algeria, the color line here is the class line. Little Rock reverberated around the world with the force and speed of the Russian apoplexy and expressed the Achilles heel in American democracy at home as well as abroad. It needs something more like the vapid theory of "indirect aggression" to win the global struggle for the minds of men. The direct landing of troops in Lebanon speaks much louder than this theory of "indirect subversion." It also becomes the focal point for the mounting hatred of the Arab people against American domination.

The truth is that the dollar diplomacy and gunboat enforcement which has characterized British, American and French domination of the oil-rich Middle East has not stopped with the nominal independences of these countries. On the contrary. Now that the two poles of world control—America and Russia—consider no part of the world outside of their "sphere of interest" every single incident becomes that brink of the precipice that might set off World War III.
THE WORLD IS DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS

The world has never been closer to World War III than presently. Those directly involved in the never-ending series of “incidents” of our crisis-ridden world are Communists China and Formosa. But everyone, rightly, is looking, not at Mao and Chiang, but at Khrushchev and Ike.

For the truth that is as big as life and as awesome as death is that our contemporary world is divided into two, and only two, parts—Russia and America. No matter where the crisis breaks out at any point—whether it is immense China with its 600 million inhabitants, or little Lebanon, or no matter who next gets involved—even if it is America’s “major” ally—as was the case during the Suez crisis when Britain and France joined Israel’s attack on Egypt—those parties must withdraw when Russia and America are not ready to come to blows at that spot. Are they ready now?

BRINK OF WAR STRATEGY

That brink-of-war strategist, Dulles, has gotten himself so wound up in abstractions on “aggression” that he cannot see the forest for the trees or, more precisely, he cannot see the Holocaust that could put an end to civilization as we have known it, for the byplay of Mao on Quemoy.

Of course, the “aggression” is on the part of Mao’s China—if anyone today can be shocked by the ordinary imperialist ways of reclaiming an island which is so near the mainland that all American reporters are comparing the distance from Quemoy to China to the relationship of Staten Island to New York City.

In course, acting on Mao’s initiative, Khrushchev agreed that the “timings” is perfect for, in the world’s eyes, America’s landing troops in Lebanon hardly entitled the Administration to shout “aggression” at another.

No one in this country doubts that the Administration would hardly win a popularity poll now. Fully 67% of letters received at the State Department are against the Administration’s China policy. No war threat has ever been more unpopular than the present one. President Eisenhower recognized that fact when he doubled up his tongue for his appearance on TV. Eisenhower said, at one and the same time, that he would not sacrifice a single American life for Quemoy—but that the “bigger principle” was “non-aggression.”

In a word, he will not let a single American soldier die “for” Quemoy, but he will let thousands die on Quemoy.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE SAY “NO” TO WAR

No wonder that the American people will have none of Ike’s gobbledegook, and turned instead, to watch TV’s other show, “The Price Is Right.”

Ike’s price was as phony as his “principle.” What is involved is not “aggression” or “non-aggression.” What is involved is this: will civilization hang on the brink of nuclear destruction because the two giants contending for world power are presently so crisis-ridden in their own countries, with their own working people, that they are ready to shoot it out?

It will not be as easy to switch off the war as it was to switch channels when Ike spoke. But the American people have thus shown where they stand in no uncertain terms: this senseless rush to war better stop right now.
War Clouds Over China

Listening to a radio report of American military build-up in Formosa, a neighborhood shoemaker remarked bitterly, "Whenever they get into trouble with a bunch of people, they try to get out of their troubles by pushing us into the death of war."

"Of myself, in my own life have gone through two World Wars and I will surely live to see a third. I was a soldier in the Italian Army in World War I, where my brother was killed. My son was killed as an American soldier in World War II. Now my grandson has been drafted. When the bombs fall for the next one, he will be there and no one here will be saved. It makes me feel that they want to wipe out my whole family for three generations—and for what?"

"BRINK-OF-WAR POLICY"

The administration's brink-of-war policy—which almost landed us in war over Formosa three years ago—has now reached such a level of malicious indifference to the American people that commentators have openly warned that this policy can plunge us into a terrible war of atomic annihilation beyond our reach. Not only have the Democrats criticized the policy, so have Republicans. Even businessmen, who have long wanted to profit from trade with Red China, whisper that Mao Tse Tung, not Chiang Kai Shek, should be recognized.

In general, faced with the daily reality of layoffs and price-up, the Administration doesn't talk much about the administration's China policy because it seems to everyone that we should go to war over Quemoy or Matsu or Formosa.

It seems senseless but not just words. We're playing with. Our lives are in the hands of men who can seriously think that if war comes now it will be another "police action" as in Korea, or a "local" Chinese-American War.

Both Russia and America have nuclear weapons and have stated again and again that they're ready to use them. The question is not whether America will recognize Communist China, but whether Russia and America—the two major powers of today's world domination—will bring us a nuclear war of total destruction, using Formosa as the excuse.

When American troops landed in Lebanon last summer, American standing in the Middle East reached it's lowest point and the colonial countries of Asia and Africa were united in their opposition to American policy.

So bankrupt is world capitalism that the crisis in Formosa enables state capitalists Mao to strengthen his masquerade as a revolutionary at home, and as a leader in the colonial struggle against the ravages of Western imperialism.

So corrupt is Chiang Kai Shek, to whom American Far Eastern policy is wed, and so universally detested is he by the Chinese, that Mao found it easy to create a situation whereby he could point to the threat of foreign intervention in order to divert the mounting unrest of the Chinese masses.

INSIDE MAO'S CHINA

What is the situation inside China itself? First there is the fact that Mao is head of a government which speaks for over 500 million of the Chinese mainland, as against Chiang Kai Shek, whom they expelled, to the small island of Formosa where he can't even speak for the 500,000 over whom he rules.

Then there is the fact that in over 10 years of China's struggle for unification and independence from foreign rule, Mao, in 1949, with his powerful peasant army was able to unify China and expel foreign rule and subdue or incorporate the various war lords who had separately bled their own provinces. It was one thing for Mao to win almost unanimous support against Chiang. But the rationalization of China's centuries' old poverty and its reconstruction from 30 years of war devastation is an entirely different matter. Fulbright and others have criticized the totalitarian state capitalist controls with a ready made one-party Communist apparatus which he had built up in his army.

Of 650 million, less than 15 million are listed as workers, and the rest are engaged in the most back-breaking impoverished agricultural labor in the world. If the poor peasants thought that by getting rid of Chiang Kai Shek, they'd free themselves from exploitation and better their own conditions, one of Mao's spokesmen set them straight by explaining that "the basic aim of agrarian reform is not purely to realize that poor peasants is designed to get free the rural productive forces."

If the workers thought that under Mao they could improve their conditions of life and labor, the state should know that they had better submit to speed up—or else—by warning these workers who "do not clearly see the relation between the interests of the leadership and the interests of the State... and. regards to the financial ability of the State, demand too high wages... and living conditions."

Of the 15 million classified as workers, less than 5 million are actually industrial workers, the remaining 10 million are administrators, technicians, teachers, government workers.

To force the workers and poor peasants to submit to this weight of oppression, Mao has regimented every single aspect of family and personal life.

PUTTING WOMEN TO WORK AND RURAL "COMMUNES"

The latest and most ambitious scheme is what the Chinese rulers dare call rural "communes." Any re-
In face of this, all previous and still existing, forms of control and spying on the population, such as black committees in the cities and health stations in the Villages, for maintaining police control, pale into insignificance before this super-regimentation and plan to push all labor into forced labor, literally around the clock.

30. MASS RESISTANCE

Nevertheless, mass resistance can be seen on the countryside just like in the city. Thus the latest information, especially that given to its “comrades” (read: small and large bureaucrats, ofﬁcials) is to show up a bit. For example, they have been told that this reorganization need not at once abolish “co-operative ownership,” and must not interfere with the gathering of the autumn’s harvest.

Despite this totalitarian terror, the workers’ resistance can be glimpsed from the repeated complaints in Mao’s ofﬁcial newspaper, The People’s Daily, which blasts workers for being absenteeism, lateness, violation of factory regulations and working procedures and the large number of defective pieces and rejects which are produced.

The speed with which the discussions unleashed by his famous “Let 100 ﬂowers bloom” speech were forbidden, and the mass arrests which followed, show how widespread is the unrest in all strata of the population.

AMERICAN CRISIS

If the timing of the Formosa crisis indicates the mass unrest which Mao is trying to divert and suppress in China, it also reﬂects the internal unrest in America. Not only did the Administration reveal its hand in the Middle East at a time when millions of American workers were being laid-off, the actual sending of military units to Formosa took place at a time of intensiﬁed repression of Negroes in the South.

What lies beneath the Russian-American maneuvers in the international crisis, is the fact that neither Mao nor Khrushchev can solve their internal contradictions any more than the American capitalists can.

The one thing they have in common is that they are all willing to sacriﬁce the lives of the world’s millions to maintain their power.

September 20, 1958
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"THE CONFEDERACY, THE CONFEDERACY"
by Raya Dunayevskaya
author of MARXISM AND FREEDOM

A new law in righteous indignation was reached by President Eisenhower when he lost his temper not so much at the fact that hoodlums had bombed Jewish synagogues as at the fact that those hoodlums called themselves "The Confederate Underground." In a high pitched voice and with barley eyes, President Eisenhower declared that he had been raised and educated to have "the highest respect for the Confederacy."

Which side of the Civil War was he on anyway?

Not that President Eisenhower is alone in this "high respect" for the instigators of the most bloody, most costly, most unjust rebellion. Historians have been busy rewriting our civil war history even when President Andrew Johnson got away with his treasonous conduct on the whole question of Reconstruction. That is the unavoidable consequence of Bourbons wars that dare not carry through what they themselves have started—a revolution against slavery which was the way of life of their Bourbon co-rulers.

Because the only way to reconstruct the south on truly new, human beginnings was to have the Negro as its base, the victorious industrial North preferred an unholy compromise with the defeated plantation South. They sold off four long years of destruction and a million American lives in order to re-establish the South as the white man's land.

THE UNION

It was not by accident that "the principle of Union vs. states' rights" was never so firmly set down that some smart lawyer couldn't find his way around it. To this day we suffer from this.

Three long years have passed since desegregation in education did finally become "the law of the land." But not a whim of this law rules the Deep South. As for the rest of the uneducated South, what we are witnessing today in the bombings of desegregated schools is only the natural outgrowth of demagogues in high office from the President down, inspiring litigation that will go on and on and on till they have relaid the clock back 100 years of "white supremacy."

The laws do not cut to the same end as the legitimate expectation of the legal way around the laws, such as Governor Faubus, who has state power, renews his cohorts that he will create legal ways to protect their disregard of Federal law, the Confederate Underground renews its hoodlums that it will find legal, and illegal, ways to protect them.

The inspiration for their arrogance is the FBI that could not uncover the KKKer who set a cross burning at the home of Supreme Court Justice Warren, not to speak of finding those who had bombed Negro churches, desegregated schools and Negro homes.

The inspiration for their illegal acts is the legal act of the justices of the Alabama State Supreme Court, who refused to reverse the death sentence against a Negro worker for allegedly stealing $1.50. These high and mighty dispensers of Southern justice defended their barbarous action on the basis that "it is not the amount stolen that counts, but the principle." What principle? Which uncivilized planet do these rulers of ours inhabit?

The inspiration for these acts, legal and illegal, comes from the man armed with the office of Presidency and the power of the Commander-in-Chief.

TIME AND PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Recently, President Eisenhower gave vent to his personal feelings that the Supreme Court had acted in haste—that we must "understand," the South and give it "sufficient time."

How many centuries is "sufficient time"? In 1845, at a time when the United States' contention with Russia for world power was suffering setbacks, in the struggle for the minds of the colored peoples of the world, the United States Supreme Court finally moved to make desegregated education the law of the land—only to find that the ever-patient admiral of the Confederacy, President Eisenhower, was incapable of enforcing so elementary a democratic principle.

NEGRO INGENUITY

Desegregated education never will become the law of the land until the Negro enforces it. The Negro youth that bravely treks the law suits of Gov. Faubus to enter Arkansas high schools have now been shunted aside by the purely legal battle the N.A.A.C.P. is carrying on. The Negro youth that came to the aid of the brave Rosa Parks who refused to give up her seat on an Alabama bus have, again, been left outside of the actions planned by the one who came to read that movement. Rev. J. H. Jackson wrote books. The white labor bureaucracy, whether of the old school, like Meany, or the so-called new school, like Beatty, have their consciences all too easily satisfied by mere money contributions to the legal battle. If you walk into any Negro community you feel it at once the dissatisfaction with the established leadership and the feeling of their own ways to win full democratic rights.
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AMERICAN Socialism and eugene V. Debs
by Ray Dunayevskaya, author of marxism and freedom

This month socialists are celebrating the 100th anniversary of the birth of the American Socialist, Eugene Victor Debs. Like the Communists who try to hide behind the name of Karl Marx although they have transformed that theory of liberation into the practice of enslavement, the Socialists use the name of Debs to cover up their compromise with capitalism. The prase of this native revolutionary is strictly for memorial purposes only, as if the new society for which Debs had given his life will come to be without the type of revolutionary struggles Debs had to carry out in his days.

Eugene Victor Debs had been a militant trade union leader. It was during the great Pullman strike in 1894 that he was convicted to socialism. When the Federal troops were called out to put down that strike, he wrote: "In the gloam of every bayonet and the flash of every rifle the class struggle was revealed. The capitalistic class, the working class, the class struggle."

This is where the Socialists of today stop. It was only the beginning for Debs. His greatest development came with his opposition to World War I. Once again he found himself in prison, this time for his anti-war views. For the first time in American history a man in prison was selected to run for President. A million Americans voted for him. The problems that faced Debs when that "war to end all wars" only ended in a depression are still with us. It is only the Socialists who have changed, not the objective situation.

LINK TO ABOLITIONISM
Debs was the direct link to the great Abolitionist movement. It was only the beginning of the fact that when he was a young man he chaired a meeting for the Abolitionist leader, Wendell Phillips. Debs was then secretary of the National Locomotive Freedom and in that capacity had invited the great orator of the Abolitionist movement to speak to his union. Phillips was in his 70 years old, but still in the forefront of every social movement.

A new relationship of men to women was also first worked out in that movement to abolish slavery. From the first, women were active in the anti-slavery societies. The world anti-slavery movement forbade women's participation and this split the movement. The American Abolitionists not only welcomed their participation but some of them, in turn, became involved in the women's movement for their own rights. Frederick Douglass was among the first to come out and champion the independent movement of women. It was he who chaired the first meeting of the Women Suffragist Movement when the women still felt they needed a man to chair their meeting.

The masthead of William Lloyd Garrison's Liberator was: "Our country is the world—our countrymen are mankind." Finally just as in the struggle to abolish slavery, Wendell Phillips felt that true freedom could be achieved in the South only if the freed black men were made the basis of the new South, so now he felt that only labor itself, white and black, could reconstruct society on totally new, truly human beginnings. That vision Debs too saw and that need for a new society is still with us.

THEORY AND PRACTICE
No doubt there were many ambiguities in Debs' behavior for he suffered from the greatest weakness of the American socialist movement—its lack of a theoretical group of the very ideas which are the basis of the movement.

For example: he had hailed the Russian Revolution of 1917 as "the greatest, most luminous and far-reaching achievement in the entire sweep of human history." At the same time he remained in the leadership of the Socialist Party which opposed the Russian Revolution. The fact that that workers' state has since become transformed into a state capitalistic society does not excuse the socialists of today to whitewash "democratic" capitalism, and least of all does it give them the right to parade as "Debsites."

Debs had dedicated his life to the creation of a new society free of all tyranny, capitalist exploitation and war. There is no doubt that courage and struggle and dedication to a cause are insufficient for the creation of a new society. Without a totally new philosophy, such as Marxian Humanism, which unites practice with theory, philosophy; with politics, the struggles lack the granite foundation for that vision of the future which becomes the unifying principle that assures final victory. But those who treat the struggles of the past as "history," instead of the future still striving to be born, besmirch rather than commemorate the name of that great American socialist, Eugene Victor Debs.
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THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION

The heart of the struggle against colonialism has shifted from Asia and the Middle East to Africa. At the very moment when France, under De Gaulle, was heard loudly and clearly around the whole world: "No" to remaining part of France from little Guinea (population: 2.6 million) in French West Africa. Unfortunately, the courageous voice of the man who led the quiet revolution—Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber—was lost in the mess of the political revolution in West Africa. De Gaulle's "non-violent revolution" was not enough to change the course of the African Revolution. However, the French masses who led the mass movement to liberation, the World War II inculcated in us an outlook of an anti-imperialist creative activity, and how to see the African intellectual in a dilemma of thinking.

When I was in France in 1957 I met a leader of the African movement who described how the African masses, still played by illiterate and without any organized labor movement, trade union or political, attempted self-rule after defeat of the axis. He was talking about the French Cameroons where the population as a whole, every man, woman and youth—turned out to try to govern themselves. He said none of the leaders had expected such a mass outbreak and did not have sufficient "membership cards." The revolution was short-lived for the French, with the connivance of the American military, speed with guns to re-establish their colonial rule.

The sporadic African revolutions have been overshadowed by the more comprehensive revolutions in Asia and the Middle East. By the middle of the 1970s, the world was waiting for the awakening of the masses in far-off Africa, hardly rooted space in the press. But this African leader came in person to the scene of revolution. In the spring of 1974, he left the French Cameroun for the Central African Republic, where he led the movement to independence. When he was advised to return to France itself, he said, "We will use Chinese mass labor methods if necessary." The Chinese "great leap"—from semi-feudalism to state capitalism via forced labor—to be the road of the African Revolution? We do not believe that the African masses who led the movement to liberation after World War II inculcated in us an outlook of an anti-imperialist creative activity, and how to see the African intellectual in a dilemma of thinking.

When I was in France in 1917 I met a leader of the African movement who described how the African masses, still played by illiterate and without any organized labor movement, trade union or political, attempted self-rule after defeat of the axis. He was talking about the French Cameroun, where the population as a whole, every man, woman and youth—turned out to try to govern themselves. He said none of the leaders had expected such a mass outbreak and did not have sufficient "membership cards." The revolution was short-lived for the French, with the connivance of the American military, speed with guns to re-establish their colonial rule.

The sporadic African revolutions have been overshadowed by the more comprehensive revolutions in Asia and the Middle East. By the middle of the 1970s, the world was waiting for the awakening of the masses in far-off Africa, hardly rooted space in the press. But this African leader came in person to the scene of revolution. In the spring of 1974, he left the French Cameroun for the Central African Republic, where he led the movement to independence. When he was advised to return to France itself, he said, "We will use Chinese mass labor methods if necessary." The Chinese "great leap"—from semi-feudalism to state capitalism via forced labor—to be the road of the African Revolution? We do not believe that the African masses who led the movement to liberation after World War II inculcated in us an outlook of an anti-imperialist creative activity, and how to see the African intellectual in a dilemma of thinking.

The African intellectual in a dilemma of thinking.

The first stage of the African revolution was thus stifled at birth, the Communists did play anti-colonialism and in 1966 participated in the Resistance Movement (Communist Democratic Italy—CDI). In those years Felix Houphouët-Boigny of the Ivory Coast, now Minister in De Gaulle's Cabinet and author of "We don't want independence," spoke quite diffidently for freedom for the long-oppressed African people. Next to him was the labor leader, Sokon Toure—who even then said that the chief goal of Africa was "lots of capital." But to attract capital, we must inspire confidence in investing. Our responsibility is to inform the African people of their responsibility in this matter.
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WILL HISTORY REPEAT ITSELF AS TRAGEDY OR AS A BANNER UNFURLED?

History is forever repeating itself without our learning from it. When capitalism moved somewhere into the African masses, it was to be a new perdition. With every new competition, to monopoly, control, there were socialists who saw in that competition a social "order" that would make it "easier" for the workers to take over. When that kind of socialism collapsed, it was a house of cards at the outbreak of World War I, there was a middle-class savage who called for "United States of Europe" as a possible stage in the advancement of revolution. Lenin would have nothing to do with those who considered revolution nothing but a "taking over" of political rule. Unless the population to a man would run production and the state, that type of revolution would lead to nothing but a return to capitalism. Although the African masses are as big as life to prove the point, the African intellectuals are repeating all the old mistakes, and adding some new ones to boot.

The desire for unity of the African peoples is a powerful force. But the desire for unity against colonialism is one thing. It is quite something else when unity is attempted under the catch-all of "the African Personality" which includes republics and monarchies alike, and excludes the shah's emir (native management of foreign capital), the rule in Liberia, dominated by the American banks, and colonialism.
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policy: "For too long in our history," thundered Nkrumah, "Africa has spoken through the voice of others," and then down in a whisper: "Now what I have called the African Personality in international affairs will have a chance of making its proper impact." This, in turn got translated into a sort of watered down nationalism.

By December, the conference, this time held on a non-governmental level, allowed Padmore to expand himself so that the Manifesto for the conference stated that it would "formulate and proclaim our African Personality based on the philosophy of Pan-African socialism as the ideology of the African Non-violent Revolution."

While Nkrumah is blending his "Pan-African socialism" with the rule both of the tribal chieftains and British-type industrialization, Toure had his theorist―the Frenchman Jean Bayeux―work up a heady brew called "African communism." This is supposed to blend African communalism and European socialism. If you add to that "single party democracy," where exactly would all these "roads to socialism" lead us?

MUST INDUSTRIALIZATION BE TOTALITARIAN

The truth is, by whatever name you call it, neither the new euphemisms, nor the new black color, can hide the old smell of exploitative capitalism. Of course, industrialization of Africa is a necessity. Of course, this cannot be done outside of a relationship to technologically advanced industrial powers. But must the method be capitalist? Must we see in Africa what we have already seen in Russia and in China―the emergence of a new ruling class that comes with state power and capitalist industrialization and is totalitarian? The physiognomy of the African intellectual may be idealistic and fresh at first; but the road upon which his present policies set him will make it impossible to resist the objective pull of world capitalism.

The responsibility of the Marxist Humanist is not that of pushing the Africans helter-skelter on the road of industrialization as if industrialization by itself answered the desire for liberation. Nor must the Marxist Humanist―African or Pan-African, or Yugoslav or French for that matter―create new points of conflict such as "violence and non-violence" which can only blind one to the realities of the true reconstruction of society on new beginnings. Revolution is, after all, not just evolution in the fullness of time and in the essential human form called forth by the need of the creation of this new society on totally new beginnings whose point of departure and point of return alike center around the relation of man to man at the point of production, in the state, and within the context of a human world.
TWO WORLDS

BY RAY DUNLOP
Author of MARXISM AND FREEDOM

A FORGOTTEN PAGE OF AMERICAN HISTORY

ROLE OF THE NEGRO IN THE POPULIST MOVEMENT

As the latest crop of books from white Southern “liberals” once again prove, the plea for time to “readjust” (another civil war?) is based on the most popular white fetish that the South has “always” been solid on: the race problem.

The truth is that one of the greatest pages of our history—the Populist movement—has its Southern chapter written by white and Negro acting together. “Never before or since,” writes the historian, C. Vann Woodward: “have the two races in the South come so close together as they did during the Populist struggles.”

The simultaneous growth of monopoly and depression during the turbulent eighties and the “heart-breaking” nineties found the agricultural South at the mercy of the city merchant and ground beneath the wheel of the railroads: their high tariffs, established by an unholy combination of railroad tycoons and the Government. In these self-defense, the farmers—to an extent beyond the middle class and poor, West and South—united to challenge not only the unbridled rule of Eastern capital, but also their own race prejudices.

One of the incidents during this period will show just how strong the unity of action between white and Negro was. A Negro Populist, H. S. Doyle, was confronted with a lynching threat. A white Populist leader, the Georgian, Tom Watson, then declared:

“We are determined to insist that the people, the whole people, white or black who wants to talk about the facts shall do it, and the man doesn’t live who shall touch a hair of his head without fighting every man in the People’s Party.”

In those days Tom Watson meant what he said. He followed this declaration up by giving Doyle shelter and sending out riders on horsecar for assistance. We have a description of this from the biographer of Tom Watson: “All night armed farmers roared into the village. The next morning streets were lined with buggies and horses, and the men were busy and on the way to the next meeting.”

POPULISM AND NEGRO SELF-ACTIVITY

Populism was a power to be reckoned with both in state and national politics. It was instrumental in the election of Populist governors as well as state and national representatives. The National Colored Farmers’ Alliance alone numbered no less than 1 million. Although separately organized, from the white agrarians, it waged its battles together with them. At one blow the unity of white and black not only shattered the Solid South but threatened to do the same to the two party system.

Tom Watson gave expression to the Populist principle of a united front of white and Negro in these words: “Now the People’s Party says to these two men: ‘You are kept apart that you may be separately freed of your earnings. You are made to hate each other because upon that hatred is reared the keystone of the arch of financial despotism which enslaves you both. You are divided and blinded that you may not see how this race antagonism perpetuates a monetary system which beggars both.”

It is true that by the time of World War I the old Watson became a race-baiter. The greater truth, the one that will live in history, however, is that, under the impact of the objective situation, that man was spokesman for, and a practitioner of, black and white unity. Of course, he buckled under when the different classes within the agrarian movement separated. When industry won the battle over agriculture, planter and cotton picker found different class alignments. The irresistible power of an idea with a mass following was no longer irresistible when the mass—in this case the National Colored Farmers’ Alliance—called for a general strike of Negro cotton pickers.

Poor and rich divided, and so did the South. The president of the National Alliance (white) advised the farmers: “To leave their cotton in the field rather than pay more than 50c per hundred to have it picked.” The schism within the movement made it easy for the industrialist to unite with the planter to thwart the stirrings for a truly new social order.

The point is that while the Populist movement did sweep the country, it had found its most radical expression in the South. This was seen both in-the-white agrarians’ attitude to the Negro, and in the Negro’s striving to push the movement forward by mass action of the cotton pickers.

As we have seen, at the very height of the ‘progressively’-ridden post-Reconstruction period, when the South was supposedly solidly white in thought and action, the unity of white and black shattered both the Solid South and the two party system. In the same way, the self-activity of the Negroes foreshadowed the class struggles to come and which we are living through today.

*Prof. Vann Woodward is one of the very few white historians who have made a great contribution to the study of American history by not ignoring the role of the Negro. He especially his work, TOM WATSON, Agrarian Rebel, from which the quotations in this article are taken. (Hillenbrand & Co, New York, $3.)
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I give over my column this issue to a letter of protest the Editor received

CONDITIONS OF LABOR IN RUSSIA

I must strongly object to the publication of my article, "Labor and Automation in the United States" in an issue of Advance which carries your fantastic editorial whitewash of labor conditions in Russia, entitled "Russia Marches On!" thus giving the impression that Automation in Russia is a new development and that the conditions in the factory is any better than those in America. Nothing could be further from the truth. Had I known that that was the purpose to which you would put my attack on American capitalism—trying to transform it into a whitewash of Russian state capitalism—I would never have consented to this fraternal exchange of articles on conditions of labor in each country.

CONDITIONS OF LABOR IN RUSSIA

In MARXISM AND FREDOM, to which my article referred, labor conditions in Russia are seen to be no better, but rather worse, than in advanced private capitalist economies. Under Russian state capitalism the exploitative conditions in the factory co-exist with actual forced labor. The whole world, and particularly so the working class world, should have learned from the revolt of the Russian workers inside the forced labor camps in Vorkuta in 1933, a short time after the great East German Revolt in opposition to Russian imperialism there, what, exactly, Russian state capitalism is.

You could not have read the original report of Khrushchev to the 21st Congress of the Russian Communist Party, for you could not then have halted the "achievements" of that land. All your facts—all without exception—are wrong. First and foremost, the week in Russia is not shorter than it is presently in America—it is 48 hours in Russia against 40 in America. What Khrushchev promised for 1985 (how patient you seem to be) does not mean the workers anything they did not already have before the Stalin Five Year Plans were initiated. The Russian workers had achieved the 7 hour day in 1927; it was taken away from them as a "war measure" and never restored to them. That is what you call industrialization. It is iniquitous. This is what your General Secretary of the Communist Party, Nikita Khrushchev, is promising them as a result of seven years of hard work at low pay, provided World War III does not break out in the meantime. And he is certainly no adept at warmongering as is Eisenhower. The minimum pay of a Russian worker, said Khrushchev, will be $40 a month—in 1985. This isn't a mere bureaucratic distortion of an essentially workers' state: this is the "superiority" of Russian state capitalism. Is that what you wish the British workers to follow as an example? As for Automation—sure, it is highly advanced, but it produces, exactly as in other capitalist states, missiles and schnickles and H-bombs and not, as you put it (but even Khrushchev did not), "for all workers."

THE ABCs OF SOCIALISM

Of course Russia has achieved a high degree of industrialization. So has the last century. It was the American technological development superior to England, "the mother country." So in this century, in the 1960's, did the usual Japan parasite, "socialist" Russia in its rate of industrial development. Is that what socialism has got to mean—industrialization? Have we all forgotten our ABC's, that a new social order begins with workers' control of production, continues to entirely new human relations ending in the breakdown of the division of mental and manual labor so that the freedom and fulfillment of the individual is the basis of the freedom for all? (Incidentally, why not read the leads article, CONFLICT BEHIND PEACE TALKS, back in August 19, 1955, in News & Letters, for a description of Automation from original Russian sources?)

This conclusion on your part—where, on the one hand, you wish to be in a new, truly revolutionary configuration of Marxist organizations, and, on the other hand, follow the Protakist whitewash analysis of Russia because it was once a workers' state—this conclusion, if you will permit me to say so from this side of the Atlantic, is in no small measure due to the fact that you have not begun from the basic Marxist standpoint of where the worker is in production and thus not grasped that planning, without workers' control of production can only lead to state capitalist tyranny.

RUSSIAN STATE CAPITALISM

That is why Raya Dunayevskaya, in her exhaustive study of the Russian economy as well as profound restatement of Marxist fundamentals for our day, wrote in MARXISM AND FREDOM:

"The fundamental error of those who cannot understand that a single capitalist society is governed by the same laws as a society composed of individual capitalists is that they simply will not understand that what happens in the market is merely the transference of production.

They seem to think that a single capitalist society will have a limitless market. The single capitalist—call him 'Collective Leadership under Khrushchev,' Inc. if you will—would not give the worker a certain wage, a magnificent plant, completely automated, or a jet bomber, but the very step to raise the standard of living the workers. That is why Marx, throughout CAPITAL, insists that either you have the self-activity of the worker, the plan of freely associated labor, or you have the hierarchic structure of relations in the factory and the despotic Plan. There is no in-between."

Because I myself am a production worker, and therefore associate socialism with new relations of production, I took for granted that you, on the British side, who have broken with Stalinism and Trotskyism, see it in the same way too. That is why I spoke only against American capitalism and the American labor bureaucracy, but the struggle against them is certainly also the struggle against Russian state capitalism and the totalitarian bureaucracy. These two poles of world capitalism—America, and Russia—are presently fighting for world domination and threatening the very existence of humanity itself. Surely the socialist reed is opposed to both camps.
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By Naya Durnyevskaya, Author of MARXISM AND FREEDOM

KHRUSHCHEV TALKS ON AND ON

I have finally waded through the 7 hour speech that Khrushchev delivered on January 25th to the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party. Even if you give your captive audience a brisk 10 minute break for lunch, 7 hours is a long, long time to talk. When the sun suddenly shines through the windows, the ebullient First Secretary of the Communist Party has time to laugh and call the attention of the press that the sun shines on this "socialist land" that will in 1970—specifies Khrushchev—exceed America in industrial production and standard of living of the masses. Khrushchev expands himself as a theoretician. Without making any references to the Chinese "Communes," he pontificates on the fact that the "socialist stage cannot be skipped. To pass prematurely (to communism) when the economic conditions have not yet been created would harm the cause of Communism." Having theoretically put the Chinese Communist Party in its place, Khrushchev becomes the practical man and denounces those who dare to say there is any disagreement between the Russian and Chinese Communist Parties: "We have no disagreement with this Party nor could we have any disagreement."

Timed "prolonged applause" punctuate the crescendo in the speech which glorify Russia that was the first in the world to launch the Sputnik and beat America a second time in the try for the moon. Khrushchev mixes his boasts with threats of all-out nuclear war via missiles with a 5,000 mile range.

Seven hours is a long time—long enough to have some truths stand out. Khrushchev, admits that on the production front, as of this moment, Russian industrial power is inferior to the United States and as per capita labor productivity, not only the United States but Western Europe. It is here that the discerning reader can see that the real "crescendo" of the speech is not in the boasting, but in the self-defense against the "black sheep" which has attributed the change in the Russian educational system to a labor shortage.

ALL STUDENTS LIKE WORK IN FACTORIES

Last year the traditional type Stalinist Five Year Plan had to be scrapped, in trying to escape the challenge of the silent revolt (slowdowns) of the Russian workers against speed up the ever-inventive conjurer of the totalitarian state came up with a braintrust he called "uninterrupted production practice." This, Khrushchev explained to the 13th Congress of the Young Communists meant that manual training (introduced in 1956) even to the first four grades in school and extended and supplemented in grades 5-7 with actual work in shop and on farm would become the "voluntary" way of life and create a new source of labor.

Needless to say, the kept Russian press look up the refrain of "uninterrupted production practice" and on July 4th of last year Pravda assures us that the result of the experience of the schools that had switched to a rapid training study with production work (three days study; three days work) was that "All students like work in factories" Characteristic of the totalitarian state, all plans on a mass scale at the time the Five Year Plan was scrapped in 1958 made the transition point to the new Seven Year Plan (1959 through 1965). Khrushchev, the boaster, now becomes Khrushchev, the dictator. "It is the function of all the ideological work of our party and state," thunders the Top Man, "to develop new traits in Soviet people, to train them in...love of work."

What a descent from the mount. If the "ideological work" for the Seven Year Plan consists in training people in "love of work," it is a far cry from everyday from the 5th grade on telling all over themselves "to get closer to life" and rushing to work in the factories they all "like."

But Khrushchev isn't one to note contradictions. He is a master at compartmentalizing.

LABOR PRODUCTIVITY, THE PLAN AND WAGES

Because none of the sensationalism of the "De-Stalinization" Report at the 20th Congress pervaded the present speech, this Report on the Seven Year Plan rated a great deal less coverage in the daily press than the one made 3 years ago. At the same time, however, the bourgeois press behaved as if Khrushchev always gets what Khrushchev wants and "therefore" there was no point to examining how this would be done. Never did the old platitudinism, "Nothing succeeds like success," so overwhelm bourgeois and radical alike. Shooting for the moon held the journalist on earth so spellbound that, in the end, only the Russian bureaucracy itself worried as to just how it will reach the production targets since they are all based on a 15% rise in labor productivity in industry and no less than a doubling of labor productivity on collective farms.

"In view of the reduction of the working day," said Khrushchev, the practical man, who was promising a reduction of the workweek to 40 hours by 1963, "hourly output will rise even more. Higher labor productivity will account for three-fifths of the increase in output by 1965."

Planning specifies it precisely and planning rests on the basis on which the state power and forced labor camps.

And what can the ordinary worker look forward to as a result of trying once again "to catch up with and overtake America"?

"It is planned," the ballyhoo continues, "to raise the minimum wages of low paid workers from between 275-300 rubles a month to between 300 or 600 rubles a month. That is approximately $100-120 a month at the official Russian exchange! (The ruble has no value on the international exchange.)"

So we have wandered all over the globe and unto the moon but had to return to earth, Russian earth, to find that the key to the Seven Year Plan is in labor productivity and that the Russian worker and peasant will once again bear the heavy burden of industrialization. We can be sure that the Seven Year Plan will meet with resistance by the Russian masses who see no reason to increase their labor productivity when conditions of labor after three decades of Plans are no different than the exploitative conditions under private capitalism.

April 1959
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BY REV. LEVINSHANK, Author of "Aryan and Freedom"

MAY 1 AND THE SHORTER WORK DAY

During the first week of May this year the United Steel Workers presented its demand for a shorter workweek. That it is a ludicrously low demand—a cut from 40 to 36 hours a week—is contributing to the fact that even the so-called radical press is giving it little publicity. The demand is of great importance, nevertheless. It is the first time in long, long decades that a union at contract time put such a demand on the negotiation table.

No doubt it was accidental on the part of the present union leaders to issue this demand in the first week of May. But, again, the significance cannot be lost in the accidental nature of their timing when, historically, May 1 is indissolubly connected with the struggles for the 8 hour day. The initiation of the struggle for the 8 hour day coincided with the founding of the first National Labor Union in America.

Eight-Hour Leagues sprang up everywhere. "In the United States of America," wrote Marx, "any sort of independent labor movement was paralyzed so long as slavery disfigured a part of the republic. Labor with a white skin cannot emancipate itself where labor with a black skin is branded. But out of the death of slavery a new vigorous life sprang. The first fruit of the Civil War was an agitation for the 8 hour day.

The severe financial crisis of 1873 dealt a death blow to the Eight-Hour Leagues, but not to the idea for an 8-hour day. In 1886 not only the idea, but the actions to put it into effect, began to gain momentum at this time by the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions of the United States and Canada, later to be known as the American Federation of Labor. It was this organization which specified that the date for the struggle in the form of a general strike would be May 1st.

The struggle for the 8 hour day during the decade of 1880s received a real blood bath from the counter-revolution initiated by the companies with the help of the government. The anarchist labor leaders, Parsons, Spies, Fisher and Engel, were railroaded to the gallows.

This unfulfilled demand of the counter-revolution did not stop the movement for the 8 hour day. On the contrary, the conservative head of the A.F. of L., Samuel Gompers, looked for international help. As he put it in his reminiscences of the year 1899: "As the time of the meeting of the International Workingmen's Congress in Paris approached, it occurred to me that we could aid our movement by an expression of world-wide sympathy from that Congress."

They got more than sympathy from the International at its Paris Congress, which immediately adopted the following resolution: "The Congress decides to organize a great international demonstration, so that in all countries and in all cities, on one appointed day, the toiling masses shall demand of the state authorities the legal reduction of the working day to 8 hours... Since a similar demonstration has already been decided upon for May 1, 1889, by the American Federation of Labor at its Convention in St. Louis, December 1888, this day is accepted for the international demonstration."

THE UNITY OF PRACTICE AND THEORY

Just as the Marxist world organization had adopted the American choice of May 1 as the holiday that would combine strike action with demonstrations in support of labor's demand for the 8 hour day, in practice—so, in theory, the struggle for the shorter workday became the axis of Marx's greatest theoretical work, CAPITAL. Building on the impulse, action, and philosophy of the working class, for a shorter working day, Marx drew the conclusion that the "development of human power which is its own end, the true realm of freedom... can flourish only upon the realm of necessity as its basis. The shortening of the working day is its fundamental premise."

THE PENDING STEEL STRIKE

As words, Marx's phrase—"the development of human power which is its own end"—may sound utopian. But the thought behind it, the development of the human being instead of greater and greater machines, is precisely what is preoccupying the steel workers presently.

"It will give us a chance to catch our breath," said one of the steel workers at Homestead, Pa. "We sure need it." said another. "The speed-up is just killing us." Automation has made everything worse," said a third, cutting both our employment and security. This cutting of the workweek, if we can get it, would help some."

It is not that anyone thought that all problems, either of the employed or of the unemployed, would be solved by this minor cutting of the workweek. It is that a beginning must be made somewhere. Before the discussion about a reduction not only of the workweek but workday when he addresses a meeting of the unemployed, but at negotiation time he is as silent as an Egyptian tomb. The whole question of the kind of labor which has been raised by the American workers since Automation has been made more concrete by the attempt to limit the time when the worker must work for others, and extend the time for his own thoughts.

May, 1959
NUCLEAR "PERSONAL" DIPLOMACY

The homey touch of Khrushchev and Eisenhower taking their respective spouses on their exchange visits completes the sudden surface transformation of two hostile worlds playing at brinkmanship into one world of "peace and prosperity." What transpires inside the sealed heads of those identical twins are not, however, peace plans but plans for world domination that cannot be reconciled any more than can the two worlds of capitalists and workers in each of those countries. Just as Eisenhower did not allow this aura of peace with Khrushchev to stop him from declaring war on the American workers, demanding payment of the anti-labor Landsman-Griffith bill, so Khrushchev made his appearances at automation and agricultural conferences to demand higher productivity from the Russian workers.

At the same time there is no doubt that the two powers that hold the world in their nuclear armed grasp do with a might in the cold war between them building up to the boil of World War III—if for no other reason then the fact that the intercontinental missiles with 6,000 mile thrusts are not evidently sufficiently "operational" to assure specific instead of general holocaust. Khrushchev, despite all his bragging about how near to American industrial power Russia is, is anxious to buy American goods from precision tools to cattle. The Administration is under pressure from American Big Business to do business with Khrushchev even as before World War II it was under pressure to do business with Hitler. The question is: who will get what will be put on the sacrificial altar of the bluff?

THE DOUBLE-CROSS, BIG AND LITTLE

Our crisis-ridden world is so full of explosive points that no one can say where Europe, Asia, Latin America, Africa, the Middle East or the Mediterranean countries—the double-cross will be gotten. The most likely place, however, is exactly the country Eisenhower is visiting to assure the opposite, especially so West Germany. The one governmental leader who isn’t being taken for a ride in this entire talk of nuclear disarmament is the one who has a crude bomb ready to explode in the Sahara Desert.

De Gaulle was therefore the man to expose the fact that Eisenhower is not the "official representative of the West." At the same time De Gaulle himself took a stab at a little double-cross by playing a game with Adenauer as the two are ready to fight Communist Russia. Poor De Gaulle, his desire for playing at the game of double-cross is more than matched by his impotence. Even before Eisenhower set Adenauer straight, a small journalistic pundit like Walter Lippman cut him to size.

"The truth is," wrote Lippman, "that France and Germany are for all practical purposes disarmed in Europe, and separately or jointly they are quite unable to contemplate a war with Russia. Only the USSR and USA can wage a nuclear war, and they alone, therefore, can make the ultimate decisions which mean peace or war...."

"These are the facts of life in the middle of the twentieth century."

In one thing Lippman is right. The division of the world into two, and only two parts, is certainly a fact of the life of the power politicians. Make no mistake about it. This write-off of Europe dominates the thought of both Eisenhower and Khrushchev.

This has been the dominant fact of life ever since Hitler entered World War II. This was not due to the fact that Eisenhower and/or Roosevelt was "soft on Communism." It was due to the fact that state capitalism Russia reached a point of equality with America, once Nazi Germany was defeated.

Naturally De Gaulle is an expert on the double-cross—he was once at it at the side tables or stand in the hallways all through the war planning and the peace negotiations. What De Gaulle fails to add is that there was no word of objection from him when East Europe was written off the map of Europe as a separate entity. Just as East Europe fell to Stalin’s Russia with the connivance of the governmental leaders of "the whole West," so now allies and satellites alike stand helplessly by as West Europe is being written off. The great and overwhelming desire of the peoples of the world for peace is being exploited by Russia and America to cover up this fact.

At the same time the talk about "possible" nuclear disarmament is loud and insistent while the actual preparations for war are silent but to the point. What is at stake on both sides of the Iron Curtain is the freedom of the peoples who are fighting for a truly human world free of the type of production that entails exploitation and leads inevitably to war. In state capitalist Russia or "free enterprise" America, as in Conservative Britain and De Gaulle France and in West and East Germany, the present leaders are ready for any sell-out as long as exploitation of workers continues in "native" hands. For that one inviolate privilege they are ready to put a question mark over the very survival of civilization.
TWO WORLDS

EISENHOWER-KHRUSCHEV SPECTACULAR

The show is over. The unprecedented TV, radio, and press coverage of Khrushchev's visit lasted into the stillness of Camp David, where secret agreements between two such great statesmen as Eisenhower and Khrushchev would not be open to mass media coverage, then, the whole circus tent was taken down.

LEND-LEASE

The official communiqué from Camp David carried almost as frigid an air after, as before, the well publicized show. Nothing but "clarification" of the two opposing positions seems to have been achieved on the question that brought about the crisis in the first place: Berlin. But that is only because another show, more sinister than the one on TV, has to be put on for the benefit of the independence of "allies," especially West Germany.

The main reason that Khrushchev first concocted the Berlin crisis-trade in America—is also being played in a low key and first will be given to experts to see what Russia will pay for its Lend-Lease debt. Finally, still another show, this time for Eisenhower, has been put off until Spring, with the bony statement on the part of Khrushchev that it would be easier for the Eisenhower grandchildren to accompany him than

"DOING BUSINESS WITH KHRUSCHEV"

But all these are appearances. Of course the Berlin crisis could not be "resolved"—because the two contenders for world power have no intention of doing anything but prepare for the holocaust of World War III. But meanwhile—while the missiles become so operational that each side is sure it is the other that will be annihilated in the struggle for world domination—we will have "peace," and trade. The biggest victory was won by that part of Big Business, which wishes to do business with Russia.

And this contains the greatest of all threats to the American working class, for the simple reason that at the core of the "doing business with Khrushchev" is the principle that is as Khrushchev does to his workers. Let us not forget that the biggest "insult" to Eisenhower came not from a "foreigner" but from his own golf playmates—Big Industry, specifically Steel.

Here was the President of the United States, the most powerful single ruler in the whole world, wishing to show off the steel industry to his most potent rival, Russia, and willing to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act to get the workers back to the mills—and the steel industry, feeling it had not yet succeeded in compelling submission on the part of its workers, said, "NO!" The "No" was loud and clear and insistent, but Eisenhower chose to obey it because his capitalist mentality agreed that the American workers must be chained to the machine and factory management.

ALL IS NOT WELL IN RUSSIA

Returning to these class fundamentals also illuminates the other side of this state-capitalist world, Russia—and ensures that we do not forget that Khrushchev came here not because all was well at home, but because it wasn't.

If the Russian workers had secretly accepted the Khrushchev 1-Year Plan with its impossible goals of increased labor productivity, instead of having been so ingenuous in their slowdown, Russia would have achieved what it wanted, and would not have had to come begging for trade with the country it is supposedly well on the way to "surpassing."

IF the Russian peasantry had been eager to obey quotes and ever-reach them, instead of having been so ingenuous in its resistance to them, Russia, technologically capable of reaching the moon, would not have been so technologically backward in its agriculture, that it had to have its Number One Man go to praise Iowa corn and Midwest cattle and eat hotdogs, without vodka, to boot.

If the Russian youth were not so restless and frustrated at the new society that has been promised them for three decades but which they haven't yet seen, then Khrushchev might have addressed himself to them instead of to his best friends—the American capitalist class.

USURPING THE BANNER OF MARXISM

Khrushchev, however, has one advantage none of the other capitalist rulers have—he is travelling under the usurped banner of Marxism, although Communists totalitarianism is the exact opposite of that great banner of liberation. Indeed, the stupidities of the State Department are nowhere seen so clearly as in the fact that they thought their image of socialism with horns would keep the American masses "in place." It is clear, instead, that they have a very different public to deal with since the visit of that master showman, Khrushchev—not because his hands are bloody, which they are—but because he has usurped the banner of Marxism and knows how to expose the other capitalists' war-mongering so that the great desire for peace on the part of the people seems answerless. And Khrushchev isn't limiting his peace overture to America.

WAR & PEACE

From the United States to Algeria, from China to Germany, from France to Syria, the aim of these Russia is playing now is "peace." Even reaching the moon was played down for "peace," as if all along they aren't testing the threats, not for scientific space exploration, but for war weapons to hurtle across continents and threaten the very existence of mankind. This is supposed to fit with faked arms, peacefully forget their class struggle, and be drowned in illusions of peace!

But—just as the steel workers, have refused to be cowed, although their stomachs are getting pretty empty, and just as all workers, American and European and African, refuse to separate their fight for bread from that for freedom—so the workers in each country on each side of the Atlantic, will prove to be the real antagonists against these hypocritical state-capitalist leaders. Until that struggle is settled, no others can be—because all the others only lead back to the same old exploitative society.

October, 1959
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EXCLUSION OF NEGROES WARPS MIND OF WHITES

A group of West Africans are so interrelated to Americans of African descent that they are considering doing what no other nation—publish the asyet-unknown pamphlet by David Walker, with a new introduction relating its significance to the American Negroes in the American scene in our era. They have asked us to reprint the Ten Words on this sheet that is yet to gain recognition in our country.

The split of this country into two worlds—white and Negro—warps the mind of the white much more than it does the Negro.

In a small way this warping can be seen in the books on Lincoln. The current crop are so superficial as they have been for nearly a century, because the white historian will not seriously grapple with the life and times and the activity of the Negro people in the era of the Civil War. It is as if, during that great turning point of history—1861 to 1865—history didn't turn at all. At best, the Second American Revolution is presented as a mere economic development which made this country the great industrial land it is, without the least remaking or being remade by live people. Let us turn instead to one of the live people of that critical era, the Negro, David Walker. He made history then, and his utterances are more alive today than this month's crop of books on Abraham Lincoln.

DAVID WALKER'S APPEAL

In 1829, an extraordinary sensation was caused by the appearance of a pamphlet entitled Appeal to the Colored Citizens of the United States, that legislature in the Virginia session called into special session to enact laws against free Negroes as against slaves for reading it. They put a price of $5,000 on the head of its author, David Walker.

David Walker was a free Negro from North Carolina who had settled in Boston where he earned a living by collecting rags. His Appeal was addressed to the free Negroes. He took them to task for their meekness. He urged them to make the cause of the slave their own because the wretchedness of the free Negroes conditions were due to the existence of slavery.

Walker urged them to make freedom their business. He pointed to the superiority of Negroes, in numbers and in bravery; over the whites. He took the great to task as well—especially Thomas Jefferson. Prophetically, he wrote that race prejudice would yet "root some of you out of the very face of the earth."

50,000 copies of this 76-page pamphlet were sold and circulated from hand to hand. Those who could not read had others read it to them. The South trembled at the simple words of an obscure Negro.

The Cambridge Modern History writes that "the excitement produced by Walker's Appeal had subsided when the danger of writings of this sort was brought home to the slaveowners by a rising of slaves in Virginia—an outbreak known as 'Nat Turner's Insurrection.'"

What the historians fail to see is that it was not "writings of this sort" that produced the revolts, but the revolts that produced the writings. Before Nat Turner and the Appeal, there was Danmark Vesey and the Underground Railway. The revolts of the Negro slaves were in fact one continuous chain of struggle from the moment they were brought to this country in chains of bondage. These slave revolts not only produced the writings, but the actual Civil War.

The Negroes had no money, no press, no vote, no party. They were armed only with their feelings for freedom and the certainty that they were right and could not and would not be kept down.

THE ABOLITIONISTS & TODAY'S HISTORIANS

Out of the genius of America, with no assistance from any alien tradition, there emerged the great Abolitionist movement which combined with the Negro in the cause of freedom.

As Wendell Phillips put it: "We do not play politics; anti-slavery is no half-jest with us; it is a terrible earnest, with life or death, worse than life or death, on the line. It is no law-abiding, where it matters not to the good feeling of opposing counsels which way the verdict goes, but where advocates can shake hands after the decision as pleasantly as before."

"This great American saw more clearly 100 years ago than the intellectual sees today: He saw that even the Civil War would not establish new human relations unless the blacks became the very basis of the effort to regenerate the South. We want the 4 million of blacks—a people instinctively on our side and ready and skilled to work; all the elements in the South which belong to the 19th century."

Until the historian today begins where Wendell Phillips left off he will be unable to understand either the history of his country or its future perspectives.
STAGNATION OF U. S. ECONOMY

“They will not go on” sounds like a subjective analysis of the capitalists (in and out of government) and unemployment. The point can be easily proven, but for the moment let us turn to the supposedly objective analysis of the economy which speaks of “the seeming 90%.” The one fact that even these analysts must admit is that this “continuing boom” has been interrupted by the recessions in 1919-39, and again 1933-34, and yet again 1937-38.

These periodic recessions that come every 3 years do not measure up to the Big Depression, but are they really only “corrections” to an ever-expanding economy? Were we an inhuman on the question of unemployment as Eisenbauer, and Big Business men who set his line for him, we would have to be blind as well as to see that, like the Nazi generals who won the battles but lost the war, Big Business is running the American economy into the ground. Just take one look at the “United States Monthly Bulletin of Statistics for April 1939” and you will see that U. S. ranks 33rd in percentage growth of industrial output for the period of 1932-38 and it is probably the only nation in the world which has made no gain in industrial output during this period.

THE 3 POSTWAR RECESSIONS

There is nothing accidental about the 1932 recession; it is the third in a series of post-war recessions, each more ominous than the last.

The period from the recession in 1923 to the one in 1932, and you will see that, while the value of goods and services rose from $250.1 billion to $411.7 billion, population during this period increased 9%; as against the rise in production and services of 8%, and thus on a per capita basis, productivity was 1% below the level it was in 1923. If this “pace of progress” hasn’t stagnated, has waned it, it is not Economically well to live in a country where the 4 million unemployed who, with their families, add up to 16 million.

The same period, in terms of rate of growth, witnessed a fall from 2.7% to 0.7%, during 1929-33 to 1.5% in 1933-38. Thus, in a per capita annual rate of growth, the rate of growth was a growth of 2.7% in 1924-28 became a growth of 0.7% in 1929-33. All this, you must not forget, occurred during a period of Automation and a fabulous rise in labor productivity. Since 1925, for example, the industrial labor force has gone up only 50%, but it produces 49% more per man hour.

ECONOMICS OF WORLD TENSIONS

According to Allen Dulles, who isn’t likely to exaggerate Russian success nor to underplay our own, the gross national product in Russia has increased at the rate of 3% annually as compared to the American rate of annual growth of less than 1.

The standard conclusion under such telling circumstances used to be pointed to American accumulated wealth as the backwash, mass of Russia. There is no doubt that Russia still is backward and more precisely put, it is the only one of the advanced industrial countries that still has more than 50% of its population in agriculture. Nevertheless, this argument that as the one that would be well to both America “if only” we used our advanced technology in full. The actual, not the potential, utilization is what counts in the battle of growth. We are not dealing, moreover, with a Russia that began its serious industrialization in 1929, but with a Russia that by 1939 has already achieved a sufficiently advanced technological base, to have entered the nuclear age with a forward sprint in missiles.

Finally, it is not only in relationship to Russia, that our rate of growth measures to standstill. It is true in relationship to Europe as a whole. No matter how high the accumulated wealth and advanced the techniques. In fact, for growth, we substitute mere conservation, it spells ruin. It is this exact which is left the world over, and nowhere as much as in the underdeveloped countries that look for aid in industrialization from the advanced countries.

The United Nations’ World Economic Survey for 1939 shows that the poor primary producing areas have lost more as a result of the deterioration of their terms of trade than the whole of their foreign aid. Despite the aid, which is real and real, that the advanced countries are giving to the underdeveloped areas, the truth is the inequality between rich and poor countries is actually increasing. At the same time the industrial proletariat of the advanced countries has not much to show in gains. It is here, in the relationship of labor to capital that we have to look for the cause of the world crisis.

Some serious bourgeois economists (see Thomas Balch in New Statesman, Dec. 12, 1939) see the American recession growing into an international depression, and argue that “if we are to survive” we better take a second look at the economics of world tension.

There is no escape, however, “East” or “West” from the dictum of Marx that “The real barrier of capitalist production is capital itself.”

PROFITS AND THE STEEL INDUSTRY

The steel industry has always been the perfect example of an insatiable appetite for profits as well as an ability to compel the Government to do its side by subverting production, especially in wartime. Though its profits were high enough, it cried so much about the decline in the rate of profit that the steel barons and the steel plants during the Korean war unless it was promised such quick write-offs, tax-wise, as to actually put the cost of modernization back on people. It won its point and achieved an artificial rise in the rate of profit.

By the first half of 1969 labor productivity had risen to high that with only 1% more industries could produce fully 50% as many tons of steel as were turned out, say, in 1937. Nevertheless, when compared with the fact that Europe has spent $4.36 billion on steel modernization since 1914, the American steel industry could think only of ways to improve its competitive standing and that is (1) to try to break the union, especially industrial as any say over conditions of labor; (2) to try to keep wages from rising by taking up the Eisenbauer refrain of “fighting inflation”; and (3) bring conditions of labor to match the waging conditions of the 1932’s and the absolute rule of management. Hence its uncompromising stand in forcing a prolonged steel strike, in winning use of Tint-Hartley Act to compel return to work, and presently to continue its stubborn stand in face of world pressure.

In the decline in the rate of growth, the compulsion to unemployment, as that wages and conditions can be recovered, there is all around us growing up an uncomfortable resemblance to the factors that produced the 1929 crash. Indeed, no one even in America is willing to go beyond 1939 for predictions of any continuing, growth. 1961 will see us once again plunged to “ordinary” depression over the war.
The Roots of Anti-Semitism

The two main factors of all the current anti-Semitic acts occurred, not in Cologne, Germany, but in Detroit, Michigan.

The killing of Jews, the "Judeo," by the group of Nazis that burned synagogues in the summer in the name of a teacher at the University of Detroit.

The Nazis in their attack on Germany had the goal, not to disrupt the Jews, but to disrupt the teachers in the name of a teacher at the University of Detroit. Since he had told them that "the enemy is now the Communist andанический." The killing of Jews in Berlin was a means of war in that American Nazi group is the sum of a Germanic.

This group of Jews, as emphasized earlier, were not sent to a house of correction, but given back to the custody of the church, which was originally organized only as protection for the secular brother of the "Judeo," who has since become a guardian of democracy where he is stationed in Germany.

The Army issued a statement that it would "immediately" investigate whether the soldier had any connection with the Cologne outrage. At the same time the press displayed such tender feelings in the whole matter that not only were the names of the ten men not released, but neither were those of the parents or the soldier.

This was exactly what the Nazis had intended when a Negro moved into a white neighborhood in the small isolated town of Walker, Tenn. Where the arsenal小白 is located, there was not the slightest feeling of anti-Semitism in Walker, Tenn., or anywhere else.

On both sides of the Iron Curtain.

When the United States and the Soviet Union are fighting, all the United States and the Soviet Union are fighting. On the one hand, the Nazis are killing Jews in Germany, and on the other, the Soviets are killing Jews in Russia.

The Nazis are not alone in their efforts to disrupt democracy. The Soviet Union is also fighting for democracy. The Soviet Union is not alone in its efforts to disrupt democracy. The United States is also fighting for democracy.

What is the Answer?

Long before the fighting of the United States and the Soviet Union we had our struggle in Europe. The United States and the Soviet Union are not alone in their efforts to disrupt democracy. The Nazis are not alone in their efforts to disrupt democracy. The United States is not alone in its efforts to disrupt democracy.

What is the answer to this question? There is no answer. There is no question. There is no answer to the question of how to stop the Nazis. There is no question of how to stop the Nazis. There is no answer to the question of how to stop the Nazis.

CLASS AND RACE

It matters not what the capitalists say, and which race, the problem remains the same one. That is due not only to the fact that the ruling class needs a "scapegoat" for the crimes of war but also to the fact that the population of the United States is divided into two sections, the Negroes and the Jews.

The Negroes are kept in the United States, and the Jews are kept in Germany. All the occupying powers in Germany, including Russia, are responsible for the re-establishment of the Jewish empire which was disrupted and uprooted, and is now on its feet.
FEBRUARY, 1960

Of War and Peace

KHRUSHCHEV, EISENHOWER AND DE GAULLE APPROACH THE SUMMIT

Nikita Khrushchev’s recent address to the Supreme Soviet on “peaceful co-existence” bore every mark of old-fashioned Salesianating in which the only thing new was the barbarity of the threat to wipe any “enemy” country or countries “off the face of the earth.”

“MORE KUBBLE FOR A NIBLE”

Khrushchev continued to assure his monstrously ruling body that the 17 billion rubles which would be saved as a result of the proposed out of 1,200,000 manbud movements from the army to the factories would be a mere drop in the bucket compared to the economic inefficiency of arms production. Khrushchev cited the example of how the unproductive and wasteful work of the East German workers had resulted in the permanent occupation of the entire Saar region. He said that the machine guns and mortars which were being produced by the East Germans were only good for the protection of the factories, not for the defense of the country.

“This is a fantastic weapon,” he said.

So fantastic is the age in which we live, that Khrushchev no sooner said this than one American scientist suggested it might mean that the United States should build a missile to counter the “Khrushchev missile.” He said it would be like building a “Khrushchev missile” to counter the “Stalin bomb.”

A missile that is not used to modernize the economy is certainly not needed for the defense of the country. The “Khrushchev missile” is more likely to be used to modernize the economy.

The BIG STICK—AND THE LITTLE CARROT

Once before, in Stalin’s day, there was a quick realization of the size of the army. The shortage of labor in industry, the war devastation, and the post-war unease, led Stalin’s economy to experience a “big stick—little carrot” policy. The “big stick” was a threat of force, while the “little carrot” was a promise of rewards. Stalin threatened the army with a “great offensive,” and, to provide the army with the necessary labor, he ordered the poor and destitute to be drafted into the army. This policy was successful in recruiting soldiers, and the shortage of labor was due to that.”

Presently, the proposal for a “Khrushchev missile” to counter the “Stalin bomb” is even more fantastic than the “Stalin bomb.”

A missile that is not used to modernize the economy is not needed to counter the “Khrushchev missile.”

“YOUTH AND ROCK ‘N’ ROLL”

More than bread is needed to keep the loyalty of the youth. The youth must be given a sense of purpose. The “big stick” is not enough. The “little carrot” is also needed. The “big stick” is a threat of force, while the “little carrot” is a promise of rewards. The “big stick” is the promise of a “great offensive,” while the “little carrot” is the promise of a “great economic development.”

The “big stick” is the promise of a “great offensive,” while the “little carrot” is the promise of a “great economic development.”

“APE-X-SERMISM & WORLD CRISIS

But a balance can be struck. There is no guarantee of peace. The big stick may be the key to peace. But a balance can be struck. There is no guarantee of peace. The big stick may be the key to peace.
France—the world crisis is in-
solvable. De Gaulle shows this
more clearly than the attitude of both Eisenhower and Kluge
of the French.

Here is a recurring theme: power a
of this type is most likely to
the world powers. The problem
in the present instance is France's
role in the post-war world. Given
France's past history and its present
position, the question of
Dignity raises its head.

De Gaulle France

The true role of De Gaulle's
coming to power, France
achieved a technological revolu-
tion which allowed for rapid
capital to win over petty
interests. The role of French
in Western Europe and to
its contribution to the United States.

The success of De Gaulle's
calling for a grand strategy: his
knowledge and understanding
of his own people is crucial. De
Gaulle's dream is to create a
power that is not only a
power but also a
power.
EDITORIAL

The Tragedy of France

3,000 rifles faction, who demoted to 400 during 7 days of attempts to capture the city, was suppressed by the French Army. This is a repetition of the Algerian conflict, where the French Army, without the consent of the Algerian people, attacked Algiers, and now, the same thing is happening in Algeria.

The PLOTs AND COUNTER-PLOTS

It seems that the situation in Algeria is getting worse. The French Army, commanded by General de Gaulle, is in control of the country. The Algerian people are left with no option but to fight for their independence.

The TRAGEDY

The tragedy in Algeria started when General de Gaulle, after his visit to Algiers, decided to send his elite forces, the French Army, to suppress the rebellion. The Algerian people, led by the FLN (Front de Libération Nationale), fought against the French Army, and the conflict lasted for several years.

The LOOPHOLE

The French Army, under General de Gaulle, has been using violence to suppress the rebellion in Algeria. The Algerian people, on the other hand, have been fighting for their independence.

The SPEECH & THE ACTIONS

De Gaulle, in his speech, said that the Algerian people have no right to independence. He also said that the FLN is a terrorist organization. The Algerian people, however, disagree with De Gaulle and say that they have the right to independence.

In conclusion, the conflict in Algeria is a tragedy. The French Army, under General de Gaulle, is using violence to suppress the rebellion. The Algerian people, on the other hand, are fighting for their independence.
AUTOMATION AND THE DIALECTIC

"The Scientific Revolution"

During my recent visit to Great Britain I lectured at such different places as the philosophy departments of the Leeds and Manchester Universities as well as at trade union groups in London and Glasgow, and on such different topics as Marx's Debt to Hegel as well as "Automation and the American Worker." The audiences made it obvious that neither worker nor intellectual was as oppressively aware of Automation in Great Britain as we are in America.

The intellectuals especially allowed themselves free play around the question of "the industrial society of electronics, atomic energy, automation" as if all this occurred outside of the factory that involved workers and trade reactions to "the scientific revolution." It is true that one scholar, Mr. C. P. Snow, speaks longingly enough of his brief stay in production industry as "one of the most valuable pieces of education in my life." But his preoccupation is elsewhere. He is oppressively aware, not of the workers' attitude as opposed to that of the intellectual view, but of the different in attitude between two kinds of intellectuals—literary and scientific.

Mr. Snow has followed up his new concept of these "two cultures" (first published in 1956 as an article in the New Statesman) with a lecture at Cambridge University in 1959 (since published as a separate pamphlet entitled "The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution"). Despite Mr. Snow's "valuable piece of education" in productive industry, the debate continues outside of any contact with the factory.

"The Number Two"

The number 2 is a very dangerous number; that is why the dialectic is a dangerous process," writes Mr. Snow. He thus states the fact that in our epoch it is also a frivolous one when in the hands of a bourgeois intellectual who ignores the fundamental division of society into two classes.

The dialectic process is "dangerous" one because it concerns the unity of two forces. In such a violent contradiction that they must burst asunder. The human failure centers in the fact that in the religious society the negative force which belittles society's one-ness is in the working class.

Mr. Snow is not unaware of the toll in production and the shallowness of the intellectual world. He writes:

"It was in the first quarter of the 18th century in a time that we, as intellectuals, think is the time of the Enlightenment and Jane Austen.

Mr. Snow has freed himself sufficiently of the literary confines to quote approvingly a scientist who blamed the social products of the modernism of the Nazis: Foulis, Point. "Wahlson Lewis" 8 out of 10 of those who have dominated literary activity in our time, weren't they producers, but artists?" Now realize the influence of all they represent bring Auschwitz that gets a name.

One might ask: if the literary intellectual is to be "blamed" for settling the stage for Nazism, shouldn't the scientist be "blamed" for the fact that the splitting of the atom, coupled, not in the release of the greatest energy, but on the source of one, but in the production of the most destructive weapon that may well put an end to civilization altogether? ...

Mr. Snow has fenced himself, and the dialectic, so tightly into the intellectual scientific djrral that he never leaves it once to learn the attitudes of the workers at the point of production, where the unity of science and industry give birth to Automation.

The Two-Faced Character of Automation

Let us, however, take a look at Automation and the Dialectic, or the two-faced character of Automation. None but the workers see, feel, know that Automation has resulted, not in freeing the laborers from back-breaking toil, but in reducing him to "a thing of a man"—to use the expression of a production worker I met recently.

Where the workers see the dehumanizing effects of Automation, the intellectual sees the scientific revolution as nothing more than a carrier of a new social order which would transform even the underdeveloped countries in our lifetime. Because management and labor bureaucrat alike, as well as pure scientist and engineer, all join in the praise of Automation as "progress," they are blind to the negative effects of Automation in a society as presently constituted and therefore cannot see the positive creativity in the workers' opposition to Automation.

Just as it was not the industrial revolution "as such" that tightened man's labor, so it will not be the scientific revolution "as such" that will change the conditions of labor either in the technically advanced countries or in the underdeveloped countries which, let us not forget, remained underdeveloped precisely because capitalism transported there, not the industrial revolution, but imperialist exploitation.

While it is impossible to unite worker and capitalist, the unity of worker and intellectual is not impossible, provided that the future that is within the workers' bones—that is to say, the new society embodied in the old—bursts forth as a social revolution that unites mental and manual, science and labor within the individual. Mr. Snow is not unaware that the scientific revolution must mean a social revolution. As he puts it: "Man there in (underdeveloped) countries is no longer prepared to wait for a period longer than one person's lifetime."

Needed: A New Set of Ears

The great merit of Snow's "The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution" is that he has focused attention on the losing race science is running with history, that is to say, human activity. This is a much greater contribution than that made by the old radical who fears to attack Automation and makes a cliche of "of course, under capitalism, Automation has not lightened labor, but..." ...

The old radical is deaf to the worker who, in fighting against Automation, has raised the most profound philosophical question, by asking: "What kind of labor should man perform?" He, who has a knowing look when the worker leaves the production line, saying it makes him feel as but a "fraction of a man," is incapable of hearing anything new. He may think that it is but a rephrasing of Marx's statement of the needs of society, or a.cog in a machine. The point is that when Marx said it he was formulating the worker's instinctive drive to reconstruct society on new bases. When the workman insists, i.e., the worker, finds his own formulations, we have done away with the divide between the worker and intellectual. The intellectual must therefore gain a new set of ears, not to shun at the generalization, but to hear the concrete.

(TO BE CONTINUED)
REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN SOUTH AFRICA

"Love Latina (our land)," shouted thousands of Africans as they burned their "pass notes" and marched to the police stations, asking to be arrested for thus having violated the familiar type of internal passports imposed upon them by the white rulers.

In response to Act One of this bloodless revolution for human rights, the counter-revolution burst forth in an orgy of violence, machine-gunning the unarmed masses of humanity—men, women and children. The Revolution took its death by a fast funeral and stayed away from work. The counter-revolutionary apathy (apartheid) Africa followed up its inhuman violence with blank shots charged into African crowds, declaring a state of emergency, and outlawing any political organizations, mainly black, but black of black, that dared challenge the savage white supremacy.

The Revolution—the struggle for freedom—though it comprised the overwhelming majority, 15 million against 2 million whites, was soon drowned, the white rulers who are armed to the teeth with everything from bull whips to machine guns, and from the armed forces to jet planes, not to mention prisons, the legislature, factories, mines, farms, ships and concentration camps.

This is the face of "civilized" white rule in South Africa as the economy of the country came to a standstill when black labor stopped to mourn its dead.

Life Is Cheap

57% of the industrial labor force and 22% of the agricultural labor force is African. Since without this black labor force, white oppression could not last, the murder that is reserved for military attacks. When in 1946, 75,000 miners died to strike, the strike was bloodily suppressed by removing the "extortionate" wages of 10 shillings (6.40) per hour shift, workers were forced down. They sat in the tunnels and refused to come up until police drove them to the surface "stale up by steps and level by level," as the Rand Daily Mail described it.

According to official figures, 6% of black families had a combined income below even what white Africa earns for life and health. The result has been that 56% of all Africans never reach the working age of 15; infant mortality rate is estimated at 200-300 per 1,000. But what are the petty bobbies and racketeers and babies dead in corners to white "god-fearing Christians"? Life is cheap when the skin is black!

Conditions of Labor

Only 40% of urban white Africans are wage workers and these are mainly skilled (36%) or semi-skilled (12%). While there is nothing extraordinary about the monthly wage of white workers—60 (185), it is fivefold that of black workers' monthly wage of 213 (360). Moreover, the white workers' unions are recognized while those of the Africans are not. At the same time, the black worker is forbidden to strike and the dividing line between a strike and a dispute is so vague that the police decide when it is any sort of stoppage and put down the dispute even where management would be willing to come to terms. Refusal to work is punishable with 5,000 fine or 5 years in prison or both.

The Revolt Is Continuous

The revolt of black labor has been as continuous as it has been brave nevertheless. And the illegal strikes just kept on in 1924 to 1925, in 1935 to 1936. South Africa was on strike in 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1930, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955. In 1956 the peasants have revolted in the great bus boycott of 1957. Hundreds of thousands walked 20 miles to work and trudged another 20 miles back to their segregated townships for three solid months until they won the fight against the rise in farm. The Government of Dr. Verwoerd (the Hitler of South Africa) issued the following statement: "It is quite clear that this is not too much of an economic matter; it is a political movement."

There is no doubt that the economic, political, social struggle for freedom is indivisible. So is the tyranny of white oppression total—totally depraved. Every African male in the cities can expect to be arrested at least once a year for some petty offense or other.

The indignity of the pass puts yet extra power in the hands of white "labor officials" which is actually a forced labor camp where the white African big farmers get their cheap labor. The notorious eastern Transvaal area "hires" convicts and others for 2 shillings (20c) a day.

Nothing has changed since the 1947 disclosures. When it was shown that African laborers dressed in sacks were choking with poison with their bare hands. They work under the hot sun and the sunburns and spend their nights in stuffy windowless huts with fierce watchdogs inside to cut off escape. When in 1953 pass carrying extended to women, the resistance of the women burst forth in the Zaccor and Sekhukhunwe uprisings as well as street demonstrations in Johannesburg.

Thus both in the cities and in the "Reserves" the revolt is continuous.

Political Organization

Just as arms are denied the native African, so is the representation in parliament. With the 1909 so-called suppression of Communist Act and the Criminal Law Amendment Act of February 1903, the white rulers have indeed destroyed all legal activity by political or industrial organizations that are not dedicated to white supremacy. The one organization left to them was the African National Congress under the leadership of Chief Albert Luthuli. Recently the left wing of that split off and named itself Pan-Africanism and elected Robert Mangalise Sobukwe as its president. It is he who called for the demonstration in opposition to the pass carrying. These two leaders, along with 300 other Africans have been arrested, as well as even the mildest of white liberals who oppose total, brutal white supremacy. All political organizations except those of the ruling class have been outlawed.

The African National Congress and the Pan-African Congress immediately announced that they would go underground but would not give up the fight for freedom.

Whatever cry of violence the white rulers will now indulge in, South Africa will never again be the same. The tiny minority of whites who have opposed this inhuman, insane, savage rule of the white suprema-cists long ago saw that if the Afrikaners are in the tyrannized as the white skins are, then the white skins will be tyrannized as the white skins are, for this is the human regime, not the human beings, that will have to go. It is only a question of when and how.

As Ronald M. Segal, the editor of the Journal, Africa South, whose passport had been seized some time back, wrote in an editorial entitled "Revolution Is Now": "In a society where revolt walks along in the shadow of war, labor, change and revolution have become finally inseparable."
AFRICAN SOCIALISM, Leopold Sedar Senghor
American Society of African Culture—N.Y. $1.25

"To Build A Universal Civilization"
Leopold Sedar Senghor is the poet, scholar, politician who is the president of the Party of African Federation as well as of the Federal Assembly of Mali (Federation of Senegal and Soudan). On June 8, 1959, he delivered a Report to the Constitutive Congress of his Party which, in an abbreviated form, has been published in this country under the title of "African Socialism." In its serious concern with theoretical foundations for the building of a new society, it has no parallel in today's orations.

"At a time when the weary American intellectual has been so brainwashed by the Cold War and the threat of Nuclear War between America and Russia, that he declares "The End of Ideology," (1) the world that is fighting for its freedom at the cost of its very life is Africa —is charged with a dynamism of ideas. As Leopold Senghor puts it: "A nation that refuses to keep its rendezvous with history, that does not believe itself to be the bearer of a unique message —that nation is finished, ready to be placed in a museum. The Negro African is not finished even before he gets started. Let him speak above all, let him act. Let him bring like a beacon, his message to the world in order to help build a universal civilization."

"Socialism Is A Humanism"
It is true that the African intellectual is all too conscious of the white imperialist legacy of economic underdevelopment and human poverty to reach out for a total philosophy that challenges, at one and the same time, not only both contenders for world power, but the specific colonial economy over his country—France in the case of French-speaking West Africa, which the Mali Federation is a part. This has nothing, however, to do with not knowing the ideological battles that have dominated Europe since Karl Marx raised the banner of liberation in the mid-19th century.

"Let us recapitulate Marx's positive contributions," says Senghor. "They are: the philosophy of humanism, economic theory, dialectical method." Thereafter, he writes with the simplicity that comes from a profound understanding both of "Socialism is a humanism" and "Socialism is a method." The fact that he aims to combine Marxism with utopian socialism as well as with religion in order to create what he calls an "open socialism" or an "African type of Socialism" is not without subjective motivations. But this does not obviate the fact that he wishes humanism that is Marxism to be the theoretical foundation for conducting a triple inventory of: (1) the against a new Africa; (2) the encounter of this civilization with colonialism and French civilization, and (3) the economic resources and potentialities of the African continent, which cannot exist outside of the economic complex of industrially advanced lands.

"Africa, My Africa"
So powerful and world-enveloping a polarizing force is the Marxist theory of liberation that throughout the Middle East, the Orient, Africa, there are attempts by various religious, from Buddhism to Christianity and from that to Mohammedianism, to find a bridge to it, even as there is an attempt on the part of Communist China and Russia to ride under that banner, although their state capitalist societies are the very opposite of Marxist Humanism. I do not say that opportunism alone characterizes the African intellectual. I do say that, while part of the critique of Marxism is due to the realities of present-day Africa which did not (and could not) have formed part of Marx's thought, other parts of Senghor's critique of Marxism, especially on present-day economics, is either wrong or, as in the case of religion, overly subtle. The "aftermath of Marx," writes Senghor, "can be considered a reaction of Christian origin against the historical deviations of Christianity."

"Oppression in Africa has always worn a white face. This weighs so heavily on the African Freedom Fighters that they react against any white face, even that of the worker, Thus Senghor claims that the standard of living of the European masses rose "ONLY at the expense of the standard of living of the masses in Asia and Africa" and that, therefore, the European worker "has NEVER REALLY —I mean, the white man—advanced the cause of the underdeveloped countries anybody else has."

"The socio-economic and ideological development of Africa is the responsibility of the Africans, and the time has come for the Africans to take control of their own destiny."

"White Arrogance vs. Black Cowardice"
At a time when the African Revolution is reshaping the map of the world, the Western intellectuals are attempting to impose upon it their ideologies, or more precisely put, their lack of ideology. These theories have rushed to quick tours of Africa and return to this country as "specialists." Read Sidney Lens (2) and you will see the ignorance displayed of the African's positive contributions as it "One man, one vote" summarily the whole of the African's culture.

"In the event, that "One man, one vote" discloses nothing short of a revolution against white domination that parades as "democratic Western civilization," the Bella, the Lens and their like have a long way to go before they reach the African's spiritual comprehension, not as "democratic Western civilization," but as the Bella, the Lens and their like have a long way to go before they reach the African's spiritual comprehension, not as "democratic Western civilization," but as "My Africa."
SUMMIT TO WAR?

On both sides of the Iron Curtain preparations for the peace conference had every earmark of preparations for war. After having been caught in a lie about the spy plane sent to Russia by Central Intelligence, President Eisenhower then proceeded to brag about it as if it were the thing to do on the eve of the summit.

KHURUSCHEV, not to be outdone either in a holler-than-thou attitude or in sabre rattling, condemned the U.S. for spoiling the atmosphere for peace talks, whereupon he went on to brag about the fantastic weapon that shot down the spy plane allegedly at 60,000 feet aloft.

He threatened to wipe off the face of the earth any country that allowed the U.S. military bases from which such spy planes could be sent off. Khrushchev’s belligerence nearly torpedoed the conference at its opening session where he designated the spy plane as an “act of aggression” and demanded that “those responsible be punished.”

MILLIONS, MAY MILLIONS throughout the world know that the established leaders in each country appear as “aggressor,” but that war results from much more basic causes than “aggression.” Or, to put it more precisely, acts of aggression are only the manifestations of irreconcilable capitalist conflicts.

In the present case, the conflicts between America and Russia for world domination, are kept in harness only by virtue of the class struggle in each country. This, indeed, is behind Eisenhower reversing himself and saying that spy planes have been stopped indefinitely, even as it is the reason behind Khrushchev allowing himself to be taken into a huddle by Macmillan.

Both Khrushchev and Eisenhower would like to pull the common man to sleep while they prepare for war.

Only, in part, is this due to the fact that both know that it is really not matters who is the “aggressor” in setting off the H-Bomb. Once it is set off, civilization itself is one American scientist (Dr. William Pickering) put it, is but “one-half hour from total annihilation.”

THE GREATER REASON behind trying to save something out of this train of a “decade” of summit conference, is the crisis in each country: Khrushchev’s if your plan is not to avoid a shortage of labor and Eisenhower’s Administration by a surplus of labor, that is an unemployed army of 5 million as a near-bedrock underneath his phony prosperity.

Spying and counter-spying is as common as talking of peace while preparing for war. If the latest incident proves anything at all it is that the so-called series of summit peace meetings can serve as the summit to war.

It is clear that everything in this outlined capitalist system is invested in its opposite. Just as the worker knows that Automation, capable of lightening labor, under capitalism only serves labor the more while it throws millions out of work, both at the same time just as the scientist knows that of the splitting of the atom came, not the greatest energy source on earth, but the most destructive weapon, just as the Negro knows that the U.S. Supreme Court decision on desegregation in schools, on its 25th anniversary this May 17th, has produced not a single ripple in the Deep South except where mass action has forced it; so the man on the street, be he Main St., U.S.A. or U.S.S.R. now knows this stark fact: THAT THE SUMMIT TO PEACE MAY BECOME THE SUMMIT TO WAR. THIS NOW HAS BECOME THE FACT OF OUR EVERY DAY LIVING.

This is true, whether the conference had temporarily patched masters up or not.

If Macmillan and De Gaulle are permitted now to appear as the great conciliators who will bring the Big Two together, ask any African in British East Africa or French North Africa whether they are known there as anything other than oppressors? Or ask the 100,000 who met in Trafalgar Square to protest the use of the H-Bomb. More than that, the millions throughout the world know that warfare, nuclear or otherwise, solves nothing so long as the capitalistic system which produces it remains.

These leaders cannot be entrusted with any such life-and-death decisions. It is our lives they are playing with. They must not be allowed to do so. The people themselves must decide. Only when the population to a man runs production and the state can a totally new society on truly human foundations be built.

The best for it is to hold the question of war in its own hands.
A Marxist-Humanists Looks At...

The freedom fighters of South U.S.A.

By Roya Dunayevskaya

The greatest achievement of the present freedom fighters in South U.S.A. is in its own working existence. The elemental outlawry of Southern Negro college students took the form of sitting down at segregated lunch counters, asking to be served, and committing hit and run after service related violence. The spontaneous movement spread from Greensboro, North Carolina, where it began on February 1, till it now covers the entire South, including Mississippi. In that puerile epoch, however, the form of the movement is one that of a showdown, but the more passive boycott.

At the same time there has been a deepening of the struggle, a development of mass demonstrations, the first ever seen in the Deep South since Reconstruction Days in the mid-19th century. Out of the 600 who marched in Columbia, S.C., 490 young men and women were made to stand in a compound to await trial on "breach of peace" charges although they were the ones who had been beaten by the state police and in a 45 degree snow.

"We will fill the jails if necessary" remains the guiding principle of the movement which now endures, the whole of the Southern Negro population with its slogan of "the only way to get free is to fight your way to freedom!" Again for the first time since Reconstruction, in this time, white in the South have marched in solidarity and the boycott.

Moreover, a momentum of its own, the movement is now borne on by various origins out of "local." Chief among these is the youth, the Negro youth, for Rudolph Delany and the NAACP have organized the "National Youth Exchange" for the advancement of colored youth in this movement, and give legal aid to those arrested. The solidarity of color by the Uncle Tom hands of the Negro colleges has created another problem.

The spontaneity, breadth and courage of the Southern students inspired picketing in the North of the Woolworth's, Kresges and other stores. For the moment, it compels all radical political tendencies, including the Southern students as pacifists, Trotskyists, Socialists, Americanism and Marxists. Humanists. No doubt there are also some Communists, although they have moved more of the intellectuals. Unfortunately, red-hatting has also raised its ugly head.

On March 20th, I was in New York and attended a rally in Harlem. The main meeting held simultaneously near the picketing in support of the Southern freedom fighters, was chaired by Bayard Rustin of CORE. It had as one of its principal speakers, A. Philip Randolph, vice-president of the AFL-CIO who is presently engaged in founding a Negro American Labor Council. Mr. Randolph dedicated his time to protect "the sacred, Christian, and peaceful nature of the Southern movement and its association" himself from "Communists." He then whipped out the April, 1940 issue of The Young Socialist, which is Trotskyist youth paper. It is true that the issue had a front page article in the movement which now endures, the whole of the Southern Negro population with its slogan of "the only way to get free is to fight your way to freedom!" Again for the first time since Reconstruction, in this time, white in the South have marched in solidarity and the boycott.

Necessary then at the moment of its own, the movement is now borne on by various origins out of "local." Chief among these is the youth, the Negro youth, for Rudolph Delany and the NAACP have organized the "National Youth Exchange" for the advancement of colored youth in this movement, and give legal aid to those arrested. The solidarity of color by the Uncle Tom hands of the Negro colleges has created another problem. The spontaneity, breadth and courage of the Southern students inspired picketing in the North of the Woolworth's, Kresges and other stores. For the moment, it compels all radical political tendencies, including the Southern students as pacifists, Trotskyists, Socialists, Americanism and Marxists. Humanists. No doubt there are also some Communists, although they have moved more of the intellectuals. Unfortunately, red-hatting has also raised its ugly head.

On March 20th, I was in New York and attended a rally in Harlem. The main meeting held simultaneously near the picketing in support of the Southern freedom fighters, was chaired by Bayard Rustin of CORE. It had as one of its principal speakers, A. Philip Randolph, vice-president of the AFL-CIO who is presently engaged in founding a Negro American Labor Council. Mr. Randolph dedicated his time to protect "the sacred, Christian, and peaceful nature of the Southern movement and its association" himself from "Communists." He then whipped out the April, 1940 issue of The Young Socialist, which is Trotskyist youth paper. It is true that the issue had a front page article in the movement which now endures, the whole of the Southern Negro population with its slogan of "the only way to get free is to fight your way to freedom!" Again for the first time since Reconstruction, in this time, white in the South have marched in solidarity and the boycott.

It is part of the whole movement against segregation in education which had begun when it became clear that the Deep South has, in an intensification of collaborating with the U.S. Supreme Court decision to end school segregation. The fight against segregation... on the school front is that of the boycott in Montgomery, Ala.,... seems limited to a city or state, the present struggle among lunch counters and libraries as spreading throughout the South and has called in well active support in the North. ...

Attempts at reconciliation of society always meets with the violence of the powers that be. There is no hope of violence in South Africa as characterized in South Africa, but there are fear and fire upon the leaves of the black population as well as the violence of the USSR.

The movement's opposition and participation of those who commit the violence... among the blacks is always in the hands of the oppressors and persecutors. Whether you are looking at the black South Africa or South Africa, whether you are looking at the present day or past, the same question of "how to proceed" is always evident in the minds of the people.

The freedom fighters in South U.S.A. is in its own working existence. The elemental outlawry of Southern Negro college students took the form of sitting down at segregated lunch counters, asking to be served, and committing hit and run after service related violence. The spontaneous movement spread from Greensboro, North Carolina, where it began on February 1, till it now covers the entire South, including Mississippi. In that puerile epoch, however, the form of the movement is one that of a showdown, but the more passive boycott.

At the same time there has been a deepening of the struggle, a development of mass demonstrations, the first ever seen in the Deep South since Reconstruction Days in the mid-19th century. Out of the 600 who marched in Columbia, S.C., 490 young men and women were made to stand in a compound to await trial on "breach of peace" charges although they were the ones who had been beaten by the state police and in a 45 degree snow.

"We will fill the jails if necessary" remains the guiding principle of the movement which now endures, the whole of the Southern Negro population with its slogan of "the only way to get free is to fight your way to freedom!" Again for the first time since Reconstruction, in this time, white in the South have marched in solidarity and the boycott.

Necessary then at the moment of its own, the movement is now borne on by various origins out of "local." Chief among these is the youth, the Negro youth, for Rudolph Delany and the NAACP have organized the "National Youth Exchange" for the advancement of colored youth in this movement, and give legal aid to those arrested. The solidarity of color by the Uncle Tom hands of the Negro colleges has created another problem. The spontaneity, breadth and courage of the Southern students inspired picketing in the North of the Woolworth's, Kresges and other stores. For the moment, it compels all radical political tendencies, including the Southern students as pacifists, Trotskyists, Socialists, Americanism and Marxists. Humanists. No doubt there are also some Communists, although they have moved more of the intellectuals. Unfortunately, red-hatting has also raised its ugly head.

On March 20th, I was in New York and attended a rally in Harlem. The main meeting held simultaneously near the picketing in support of the Southern freedom fighters, was chaired by Bayard Rustin of CORE. It had as one of its principal speakers, A. Philip Randolph, vice-president of the AFL-CIO who is presently engaged in founding a Negro American Labor Council. Mr. Randolph dedicated his time to protect "the sacred, Christian, and peaceful nature of the Southern movement and its association" himself from "Communists." He then whipped out the April, 1940 issue of The Young Socialist, which is Trotskyist youth paper. It is true that the issue had a front page article in the movement which now endures, the whole of the Southern Negro population with its slogan of "the only way to get free is to fight your way to freedom!" Again for the first time since Reconstruction, in this time, white in the South have marched in solidarity and the boycott.
SACCO AND VANZETTI SPEAK TO MILLIONS

Following is a letter that I have received from a colleague.

The recent T.V. dramatization of the Sacco-Vanzetti story has brought to a new generation, many of whom had probably never heard their names, but will remember them forever as two of the most eloquent martyrs in the fight for freedom. The program left no doubt that these two Italian immigrants, one a shoemaker and the other a fish peddler, were arrested in 1920 for a hold-up murder they could not possibly have committed, but were really on trial for the "crime" of being active in the organizing efforts of the Massachusetts shoe workers, and for being admitted Anarchists.

PALMER RAIDS, MCCARTHYISM?

It was a very real performance, and not only because it was so beautifully acted, but because it was so clearly not past history. Frankly, I wonder at the bravery of the producers in being so faithful to the case and to all the speeches, because every word that Sacco and Vanzetti spoke lashed out at the state of things today as much as in their day. Later I wondered if the intention had been to leave the viewer with a feeling that such a miscarriage of justice as they were witnessing was confined to the era of the Palmer Raids and the black wave of reaction that swept the country after World War I, and was "history."

If that was the intention, it certainly backfired on me! And I am sure it must have backfired on many other Americans who have not so easily forgotten the McCarthy era of only 5 or 6 years ago, and who certainly do not believe that now that "McCarthyism is dead" we need not fear another rise of McCarthyism under a new name.

"NO REASON TO MOURN"

In fact, I recalled and hunted up a column you had written about Sacco and Vanzetti in an article in the McCarty era, in which you described the millions who had rallied to their defense throughout the world and then said: "There are those who look at the struggle against civil liberties today and mourn for the solidarity of the 20's. I believe there is no reason to mourn, that to try to put the 1930's into the mold of the 1920's is wasted work. The mourners see the laws and the lawyers and the decisions of the courts. What they do not see is what is fundamental to the question of civil liberties: the aspirations and the activity of ordinary people... Whether the name for it is Communism, as practiced on the other side of the Iron Curtain by the dictators in Moscow, or whether it is called McCarthyism as practiced on this side of the Iron Curtain by Presidents Truman and Eisenhower, Senators McCarthy and Humphrey, its object is the same: to take away the right of the people to say what they want to say. What the witch-burners did is not free speech 'in general', but the specific freedom of workers using their own initiative, having confidence in their own strength to get what they want..." It was precisely this fact that made the drama so real to me and so much present history and not past.

"THEY PROMISED YOU LIBERTY"

"In that respect also, what had the most powerful affect on me were the deeply moving statements against war—particularly Vanzetti's in his long, proud statement of his principles in answer to the court's question of whether he had anything to say before the death sentence was pronounced: 'The jury hated us because we were against the war... We believe more now than ever that the war was wrong, and we are against war more now than ever, and I am glad to be on the doomed scaffold if I can say to mankind, look out: you are in a catacomb of the flower of mankind! For what? All that they say to you, all that they have promised you, it was a lie, it was an illusion, it was a cheat, it was a fraud, it was a crime. They promised you liberty. Where is liberty? They promised you prosperity. Where is prosperity? They have promised you elevation. Where is the elevation? Where is the moral good that the war has given to the world? Where is the spiritual progress that we have achieved from the war? Where is the security of life, the security of things that we possess for our necessity? Where is the respect for human life..."

In this day of U.S. Summit blow-ups and the threat of nuclear destruction hanging over the heads of all men, Vanzetti's voice rang out anew against war. It appeared to me to blend in with so many millions of new fighters for freedom that Sacco and Vanzetti never did die.
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War and Automation

(Editor's Note: It should be noted that this column was submitted prior to the opening of the U.N. General Assembly.)

The UN and Those Two Babies: Eisenhowser and Khrushchev

The not-in-person debate between Eisenhower's "open sky policies" and Khrushchev's "total disarmament" has become farcical since the U-2 plane incident put an end to the grand illusion that there never will be a nuclear war as we know it. This event exposed the hypocrisy of these two leaders (for lack of luck as well as for lack of hair).

The break-up of the summit meeting which followed was the result of a breach in the dynamics of these two leaders, for purposes of appeasement, so the break-up of the summit disclosed that Khrushchev's "effective co-existence" policy is a screen for war preparations.

The Two Byzantines: Janos Kadar and Fidel Castro

Without any qualms about whose company he finds himself in, stands Fidel Castro, that crusade petty-bourgeois revolutionary who got so quickly sucked into Russia's jet-propelled state capitalism, that he has not time to reflect on the new type of slavery he has handed over to the Cuban people who had finally freed themselves of enslavement to American imperialism. There is no doubt, however, in getting caught up in Castro's "sincere, incontrovertible stage of conscience" (to use an apt expression of that great German philosopher, Hegel).

Along with the destroyer of the Hungarian Workers' Councils, Janos Kadar, Fidel Castro is a pure bomb. He is the gaffy in the American imperialist антимшили, and no more a bystander to the grandstand play of Khrushchev, who will be host to "gaffing while talking about peace: announcing some new conquests of outer space" (referring to Mao, who is anxious to bring war on the space age). If tomorrow, but today a loan in brain-manipulation; crying about the down-to-earth freedoms of Afro-American is anything but a trick for, while shouting about the alleged superiority of the Russian over the American economy, enter: Automation, the Wages Bill, and War.

The real production — to the ruin of a one or the other pole of the economy — capital, is now under attack from unions and wildcats. Khrushchev is forever facing slowdowns and a shortage of labor.

As against the continuous revolt of the Russian workers against the conditions of labor, Khrushchev is bent on using the disconcerting element in today's technical stagnation against the workers at home as well as against the enemy abroad. The disconcerting element is obvious enough in the military field: the A and H bombs and the missiles to send them across oceans and lands are not just "moral" weapons. The very concept of war has itself become transformed; there no longer is any distinction between soldier and civilian and in the last analysis, there is little difference between Russian and American military forces. What Khrushchev, however, has aimed at ever since he won the space battle in the Kremlin is to achieve such a continuous loop in production in automation and that he is in a position to respond to the constant stream of articles against automation's use of "partial" automation, where "full" automation is called on, (difficult to the contrary) that is not the overriding consideration. No obsolescence of capital, but the human problem, is the overriding issue.

The Workers

In Russia, as in America, Automation has intensified the exploitation of the worker. In America, the worker wildcats. In Russia, he slows down. In America, unem-
ployment signals the crisis. In Russia the shortage of labor serves that purpose. Or, put more precisely, there is always a shortage of labor in industry, and an overabundance in agriculture, although none ever appear on any unemployed list since officially unemployment does not exist.

Because Khrushchev knows full well that the low labor productivity of the Russian worker (as well as that of the peasant) is not due to his "backwardness," but is the exact measure of his resistance to state capitalism, Khrushchev acts a great deal wilder on the subject than he did when he blew up the summit. In desperation he has done everything from demobilizing the army to introducing child labor in education.

The show he is now preparing for the UN to present himself as a fighter for freedom of oppressed peoples may fool Fidel Castro. It won't fool the Hungarian Freedom Fighters. Even as they know that nothing can wash clean the hands of this butcher of the Hungarian Revolution, so Khrushchev knows that flights to outer space, with dogs or with men, cannot solve the problems of this earth.

In due time the Russian workers will decide his fate. Russian and American workers must stay the hands that would unleash the nuclear holocaust—and the power struggle between Washington and Moscow will do just that long before either power achieves fully automatic production.
RUSSIA'S CHANGING ROLE IN AFRICA

Khrushchev's spectacular performance at the U.N. as "protector" of the struggles for freedom in Africa must be seen in the light of Russia's military, economic and scientific prowess. The American Government has yet to learn from Dulles' arrogant junketing of the Aswan Dam aid and Russia's taking over financial responsibility that Russia is no less a world power. Nor can any illumination be obtained from whether the old radicals or the new ones like Castro who have swallowed whole Russia's claim to being "the first power". Africa has not, and it is Africa that has been declared the new battle-ground. To understand the new stage in the Cold War we must look at Russia's changing policies there.

Up until 1953-54 Russia showed very little interest in Africa. In the midst of World War II its African specialists from among the West Indian Communists, like George Padmore, had broken with the Communist International because war had created the possibility for some African countries to gain national independence "on their own." Padmore aligned himself with Nkrumah. Russian Communists disdained Nkrumah as a "nationalist stooge for British imperialism." The same held true of their view of the African freedom fighters in French West Africa.

"The Sweet Smell of Success" Makes Khrushchev Run a Jagged Line

Nothing, however, succeeds like success. As the various African nationalist movements either won their freedom or were in the process of winning it, Russia began to sing a different tune. First, however, it walked quite gingerly. When it began to participate in the technical aid programs to the Afro-Asian world, it was, more or less, within the context of the U.N. That is to say, as the Big Brother aiding the little fellow not because he thought "the little one" of great aid in meeting the challenges of the Western Collaps, but because its neocolonialism in the struggle between East and West would leave Big Brother free for the decisive battle in Europe.

There was some change in 1958 when, at the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, Mikoyan broached the lag between African studies in Russia and African realities. But when De Gaulle, in coming to power, criticized NATO, Khrushchev rushed to his side to assure him of his "position in Algeria." The Communist Parties were ordered to stop their flirtations with the nationalist rebels.

Table Thumping-Khrushchev's New Sign

The story is a very different one now. It has come to a climax in the Congo. It is this which brought Khrushchev to New York. Lest anyone think table thumping brings "defeats," he better re-read Khrushchev's calculated "freedom loving" speech at the U.N.:

"One is the age of the struggle for freedom... Scary developments have flared up on the African continent. The young Republic of the Congo on the third day after the proclamation of its independence fell victim to aggression... The materials for modern weapons—uranium, cobalt, titanium, cheap labor—that is what the monopolies are afraid of losing in the Congo... The aggression should be done away with... We can say that French mothers whose children are dying in the fields of Algeria are as unfortunate as the Algerian mothers who bury their sons in their own lands.

A Declaration of War

Of course Russia is as interested in the uranium mines in Katanga as Belgium and America and the U.N. But for the moment, Khrushchev has achieved exactly what he set out to do on the day 13 newly-independent African states joined him, he dominated the U.N., and at the same time separated himself from his allies under the banner of peace and "total disarmament," he declared war on the U.S., the U.N., and "colonialism."

Those who think that this has not opened many doors in Africa that have not previously been opened to Russia, or that Russia's buttery of the Hungarian Revolution will make the African accept American "democracy" so openly aligned to the existing colonialism on the African continent, are blind entirely to the total struggle for freedom in Africa. There is no doubt whatever now that everything—from the abstract declarations for freedom to the detailed figures on the rate of economic growth in Russia under the State Plan—will work in the direction that under private capitalism, yes, and even table thumping as a sign of opposition to "colonialism"—will flood the African continent. It will not be long before a school of Africanists is established in Russia, and the Russian technocrats in Africa are armed not only with economic aid but the usurped banner of Marxist liberation.
The Cuban Revolution: The Year After

In the few weeks the Cuban Revolution will mark the first year of its role as a world-wide and internationalist alliance with the Russian orbit of power is framed as a Cold War victory. The allies of the Cuban revolutionaries, who can now look back on the most important political action of the Latin American mainland since the defeat of the Spanish Empire in the Americas, have been in the vanguard of a global division into two blocs. The revolutionaries, who were able to completely isolate the Cuban revolution, have been able to mobilize international support for their cause. The Cuban revolutionaries have been able to establish a new internationalist alliance with the Soviet Union, and the Cuban revolutionaries have been able to mobilize a new internationalist alliance with the United States.

FIDELISMO

Fidel Castro is a revolutionary leader who has been in power since the Cuban Revolution of 1959. He is the leader of the Cuban Revolution and the President of Cuba. Castro has been in power for over five decades and has been a controversial figure. Some people see him as a hero, while others see him as a dictator. Despite his power, Castro remains a popular figure in Cuba and has been able to maintain his grip on the country.

STATE-ISM

As Fidel Castro's leadership style is often described as a “state-ism,” it is important to understand the role of the state in Cuban society. The Cuban state is characterized by a strong central government, a large bureaucracy, and a high degree of political control. The state is responsible for the provision of social services, such as education and health care, and it also plays a role in the economy, with state-owned enterprises playing a significant role in the economy.

OLD RADICALS

Trotskyites, who have spent years in expelling Russia as a “degenerated workers’ state” headed by a counter-revolutionary bureaucracy, now feel that it is necessary to shift their strategy to one of actively supporting the Cuban Revolution. They believe that the Cuban Revolution is a new form of revolutionary socialism that can serve as a model for other countries in Latin America.

SOME POSSIBLE DOUBLE-CROSSES

What should the American workers be prepared to do? They should prepare for the possibility of a new form of revolutionary socialism in Latin America, which could be a threat to their own interests. The American workers should be prepared to defend their own interests against any attempt to undermine the American working class. The American workers should be prepared to support the Cuban Revolution, which is a new form of revolutionary socialism that can serve as a model for other countries in Latin America.

WHO ARE DOOMED?

It has been said of those who are doomed to be destroyed, that they will not know what is happening to them. This is not true. The American workers will know that they are doomed, and they will be prepared to defend their own interests against any attempt to undermine the American working class. The American workers will be prepared to support the Cuban Revolution, which is a new form of revolutionary socialism that can serve as a model for other countries in Latin America.
The New Russian Communist

...
The New Russian Communist Manifesto

On December 2, 1939, the eighteenth Communist Party, which had its base in Moscow, issued a new document, the New Russian Communist Manifesto, which, translated into English, is published by the Russian News Agency, Moscow.

The New Russian Communist Manifesto is the latest in a series of documents issued by the Communist Party in recent years. It is a comprehensive statement of the Party's policies and objectives, and is intended to replace the old Bolshevik Manifesto of 1917.

The New Russian Communist Manifesto is divided into three parts: The World, The Third World, and The International Communist Movement.

The World

The world is divided into two major blocs: the capitalist and the communist. The capitalist bloc, which includes the United States, Western Europe, Japan, and others, is characterized by exploitation, inequality, and war. The communist bloc, which includes the Soviet Union, China, and other socialist countries, is characterized by equality, cooperation, and peace.

The Third World

The Third World consists of the countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. These countries are characterized by colonialism, exploitation, and underdevelopment. The New Russian Communist Manifesto calls for the liberation of the Third World from colonialism and exploitation, and for the establishment of a socialist order in these countries.

The International Communist Movement

The International Communist Movement is a worldwide organization of communists, dedicated to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a socialist society. The New Russian Communist Manifesto calls for the unity and solidarity of the international communist movement, and for the eventual worldwide triumph of socialism.

The New Russian Communist Manifesto is a powerful statement of the policies and objectives of the Communist Party. It is a call to action for all communists, and a warning to the capitalist bloc of the consequences of their policies.

The Manifesto begins with a series of documents written by Stalin, which were issued to his followers in the years leading up to the outbreak of World War II. These documents are intended to provide guidance and inspiration for the communist movement in the years ahead.

The New Russian Communist Manifesto is a testament to the enduring appeal of communism, and to the determination of the communist movement to continue its fight for a better world.
The lesson in “world politics” Khrushchev is giving the Afro-Asian-Latin American world is this: The war that is “not fatally inevitable” does not mean that the Russia of apostles and crusaders subordinates its policy in any way to that of “the West.” To the contrary, Russia champions “peaceful coexistence” because that is “not fatally inevitable” means that “the West” is walking on glissade, any small war-start the nuclear balance. The “independent national democracies” may be far indeed in challenging the United States and Russia will do all it can to help them. A “peaceful coexistence” is the careful raising of every crisis from the Congo to Cuba.

WHAT IS OLD AND IS “FOREVER”

The Manifesto of the STP by no means limits itself to what is “new.” Neither the new third world, nor the “other” world, when global domination is being challenged, can make the Communists forget their own problems with labor in both industry and agriculture. After all, that was the essence of the Plan that issued from the De-Stalinization Congress in 1956. Khrushchev had to be reassured because the Russian people would not be fooled by the “perestroika” in accordance with the “norma” that called for a 50% rise in industrial labor productivity and a 100% rise in agricultural labor productivity.

The new Seven Year Plan is meeting opposition. The crisis in agriculture is openly acknowledged. But there is also a silent opposition of worker and peasant to big cities. The silent opposition in the most recent period seems to take the form of not going to work at all. It would appear that the Manifesto that the critics of Arabia, but is in a world problem.

The Manifesto states that “the survival of capitalism is in the minds of the Soviets, is near the end of a cycle period, even after the establishment of a socialist system.” This is the Communist understandable way of saying that the Russian capitalists are willing to go on in the same way as if they were “normal” people. The Manifesto is a reminder of the need to oppose the state, and a “Communist attitude to labor” it would be for “vigorous improvement of the scientific and technical base of Automation.” Expropriation, speed-ups, and other such tactics are precisely why labor opposition to “perestroika” was so State Plan centrifugal.

One thing is clear: the new world civilization is built on the same old capitalist foundation. The ground labor of this civilization has been taken over by the station’s own workers. The station is to make the workers produce more and more.

The working people of this allegedly “handy world civilization” know the old and forever exploitation. They were this change. The worker has no choice in how to do his work. His work may not need to be mastered over Automation but the factory or the state’s work is now the problem at home. To make the workers produce more and more.

The so-called experience I can offer any self-styled would-be Communist member of the Manifesto is to go on a steady diet of reading the Pravda, Sputnik, and Triunh, which carry on a daily campaign against “dissidents,” “traitors,” “reactionaries,” “perverts,” “traitors,” etc. This is the real propaganda, but it has a point. It is clear that the 43 years of Soviet rule has not wiped out the continuous labor resistance.
BELGIAN WORKERS SHOW THE WAY

Tens of thousands of Belgian workers have been on general strike ever since December 26th. The militancy of the strike and demonstrations of these unarmed masses has been so strong that police on horseback, wielding sabers, and on foot, using tear gas and clubs, has not been able to subdue them. The workers forced the Minis of Prime Minister Gustave Eyssen.

General Strike 1961: Effective Decisive Action

Eyssen's government, which has been in power since 1957, is now in a difficult position. The strike has spread to all sectors of Belgian society, including the transport, rail, and telecommunications industries.

The moderates, who have been in power since 1957, are now in a difficult position. The strike has spread to all sectors of Belgian society, including the transport, rail, and telecommunications industries.

Whether the moderate Social Democratic Party, which has been in power since 1957, is now in a difficult position. The strike has spread to all sectors of Belgian society, including the transport, rail, and telecommunications industries.

One thing is clear: the future of Belgium depends upon the solution of the Algerian war. If the future of Belgium is not solved, the situation will be worse than ever.

J.J.

End of the Eisenhower Administration

Just in the pre-war in which we live connect Europe with Africa, as it connects United States in Asia and Latin America. In the last weeks of the Eisenhower Administration, the General, who was power by promising to go to Korea and bring peace, ended his eight-year rule by not making any decision in the Algerian War. If he was not as tough as he was with the American economy, he must not be made with unemployment as high as in 1940. He wasiddle-classes with the mulled flat with its nuclear power plant in the United States is under international ramifications.

Entire Africa

No one was listened more by the United Nations than the Eisenhower Administration, which dated from, and is akin to, the one that preceded it under President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The only thing that has not been disciplined in any way by the mass revolt of the 20th Century has been the Eisenhower Administration. The British and French Allies were not as weak as the American Administrations of the 20th Century. The British and French Allies were not as weak as the American Administrations of the 20th Century. The British and French Allies were not as weak as the American Administrations of the 20th Century.

During the subsequent weeks, however, the Eisenhower Administration began to double-down on its policy of Krushchev's visit to the United States, by giving increased aid to the African-Belgian created "Strenuous" Alliance.

Nothing—whether parliaments, legislatures, or the will of the people on the street—nothing can stop the African nations to the Asian neutrals, nor even the UN itself—especially not the United Nations—nor even the UN itself—especially not the United Nations.
ed the Arab-Israeli conflict as part of "Africa's field." (See "Our Life and Times," p.3)

British Workers' Display of International Solidarity

What the heads of state are preoccupied with, however, and what the masses are doing above the unbridgeable gulf between workers and rulers.
The first sign of international solidarity has come with the offer of aid from the British workers to the Belgian strikers.

The British Trades Union Congress voted to loan interest-free, $100,000 to the Belgian workers. The Executive Committee of the National Union of Railwaymen has asked its members not to service our Belgian vessels at British ports.

The American labor bureaucracy, on the other hand, has remained aloof to the needs of the Belgian strikers as to American labor. Now that the Belgian workers have shown the way to independent action in the biggest official strike which Europe has seen since the war, and the British workers have displayed their sense of labor solidarity, isn't it time to compel Rauscher to stop playing capitalist politics, and define his international role in world trade union organization?

A New Page

The Belgian general strike symbolizes a new stage not only in West European labor, but also in Africa, even as the youth demonstrations last year opened a new stage in Japan, in South Korea, in Turkey, in South Africa and in South U.S.A. Just as the capitalist crises will sharpen in the new year, so the battles for freedom the world over will expand.

A new year has begun. A new page in the labor movement has been opened.
TWO WORLDS

By Roya Dounyevskaya

Negro Intellectuals in Dilemma

This failure must be analyzed. It was surely not due to lack
of motive or unavailability of scholarly work. Let us
first see what efforts Mr. Myrdal made in this direction.
He indicated that it should be recorded because of the
possibility of such a movement... "Negative outcome,"
that is, the facts and conclusions of the "solid study," was
already known by a few people by the end of the
50s. Mr. Myrdal was well acquainted with the work of
the "solid study," and he knew that it was not going
to be an easy task to bring about a change in public
opinion. He was convinced that the Negro problem
must be studied scientifically, and he was determined
to do his part in this undertaking.

The first part of the book is devoted to the study of
the Negro in American society. Mr. Myrdal explores
the history of the Negro in America, from the days of
slavery to the present. He discusses the attitudes of
white people towards the Negro, and he explains how
these attitudes have evolved over time. He also
examines the economic conditions of the Negro, and he
shows how these conditions have changed over the
years.

The second part of the book is devoted to the study of
the Negro in the United States. Mr. Myrdal looks at
the problems faced by the Negro in the United States,
and he explores the ways in which these problems
have been dealt with.

The book is a valuable contribution to the study of
the Negro in America. Mr. Myrdal's insights into the
history and the problems of the Negro are important
lessons for all of us who care about this issue.
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No criticism of Mr. Myrdal’s “value premises,” however, could have dealt them so fatal a blow as was struck by the scholar himself. This occurs when his thesis reaches the South, where, after all, four out of five Negroes still live, where the Negro problem was created, where it still has its roots. It is there that the contradiction between the “American creed” and the economic reality is sharpest. It is therefore not at all surprising that it is there that the contradiction between Mr. Myrdal, the scholar, with “value premises,” and Mr. Myrdal, the “social scientist,” becomes not only acute but intolerable.

A CHALLENGE, A WHIMPER

Mr. Myrdal, the scholar, writes that with the enslavement of slaves in the South, with the emergence of a Southern society, with the emergence of a Southern culture, independent thinking was so all-consuming that Southern thought to this day suffers from lack of free intercourse with the influence of a wider thought, a free thought of the old nineteenth century.” . . . The region is exceptional in Western non-fascist civilisations along the English Channel in that it lacks every trace of radical thought. In the South all progressive thinking entering further than mild liberalism has been practically non-existent for a century.” (Page 469.)

Mr. Myrdal, the scholar, further demonstrates that the war, which has increased the militancy of the Negro, has served to polarise Southern white liberals into an outright reactionary position. “I am impressed by the fact that the Negro intellectual is a central element in this struggle and that the Negro intellectual is a central element in the struggle for the future.” (Page 470.)

Mr. Myrdal, the scholar, writes that this “is truly a conservative” conclusion. And just to the Southern Negroes it is that if a not of the Southern Negro who is asking them to take this plunge, he writes that they can, to begin with, start envisaging “the higher status of the Negro population” (page 470). The appeal of the “social scientist” is not a social scientist in the war.” (The Virginia Quarterly Review)

And then, in the “American creed” when expressed in Southern terms, what happens now to the scholar’s “value premises.” Mr. Myrdal, the “social scientist,” begins to appeal to his Southern brethren. “You have a chance to turn your backs on the Southern stereotypes.” (Page 470.)

But the Southern stereotype, “everybody should, if possible, not be made to suffer in the South.” (Page 470.)

Mr. Myrdal, the scholar, pleads that this “is truly a conservative” conclusion. And just to the Southern Negroes it is that if a not of the Southern Negro who is asking them to take this plunge, he writes that they can, to begin with, start envisaging “the higher status of the Negro population.” (Page 470.) The appeal of the “social scientist” is not a social scientist in the war.” (The Virginia Quarterly Review)

Now here is the political formula of this massive work in a nutshell. Mr. Myrdal, the scholar, has argued the major part of the available literature on the subject of the Negro problem, which has conducted field studies and case histories, is not to be a bourgeois politician. Mr. Myrdal, the “social scientist,” begins to appeal to his Southern brethren. “You have a chance to turn your backs on the Southern stereotypes.” (Page 470.)

But the Southern stereotype, “everybody should, if possible, not be made to suffer in the South.” (Page 470.)

Mr. Myrdal, the scholar, pleads that this “is truly a conservative” conclusion. And just to the Southern Negroes it is that if a not of the Southern Negro who is asking them to take this plunge, he writes that they can, to begin with, start envisaging “the higher status of the Negro population.” (Page 470.) The appeal of the “social scientist” is not a social scientist in the war.” (The Virginia Quarterly Review)

THE TREASON OF THE INTELLECTUALS

On the whole, however, have supposed that the Negro intellectual would arise as an intellectual for the Negroes. But any such supposition is, unfortunately, quite unfounded. Mr. Du Bois, for example, who considers the “intellectual” to be the task of the “talented tenth,” did not consider it the task of the “talented tenth” to criticise a work written with so much high-brow and so little low-brow action. On the contrary, he considered it to be a “monumental and unoriginal study” whose scientific approach should be emulated (Pynchon, second quarter, 1944). In general, the Negro press nor the work with peans of praise.

A saddler commentary yet on the state of the Negro intellectuals than the Negro press is the manner in which Mr. Myrdal got from it its staff numbers. These intellectuals have never been able to keep their heads above water, although some of them seem to be so far in the field of this as to be on the opposite side of the fence. Mr. Myrdal’s chief, however, against them is that they have been influenced by Marxism.

Consider, then, the case of Charles R. Johnson, who has been so influenced and who considers the Negro problem to be rooted in economic factors. During the extensive Negro migrations northward in the period of World War I, Mr. Johnson saw the solution to the Negro problem in the urbanisation and proletarianisation of the Negro, which, in turn, would make the problem from a racial to a class issue. When the depression interrupted the continuity of this development, Mr. Johnson seemed to rely upon the impact of the crisis to cause such an upheaval in the Southern economy as to permit King Cotton. When the AAA ruined some subsidiary into cotton culture and prop up the collapsing regime of col.
The essay, written by Ralph Bunche, Jr., is titled "The Negro Intellectual in America: A Study in Social and Political Struggle." The first paragraph of the essay reads:

"Mr. Myrdal's criticism of the Negro 'intellectual' is presented by Ralph Bunche, Jr. Mr. Bunche is critical not only of the economic, political, and social status of the Negro, but of all existing Negro organizations that strive to ameliorate this condition. He calls them 'philosophical and programmatic puppets.' He is critical likewise of all Negro leaders who, he says, think and act similarly in a black groove." In his pamphlet, "A World View of Race," he even comes up with a solution to the Negro problem:

"The Negro must develop, not only, a consciousness of class interest and purpose and must arrive for an alliance with the white working class in a common struggle for economic and political equality and justice."

Yet this radical of radicals found it permissible to above his more radical criticisms in the Eberbach collection, where he finds himself in the exact position of Mr. Myrdal, for he is more critical of the Negro intellectuals who are in a position to be a revolutionary force. This is not at all a negation of the radical implications of the Chairman's remarks. Mr. Myrdal's critique, however, is valid. Mr. Myrdal does not hesitate to attack Mr. Bunche. Mr. Myrdal, however, is not the only one who has attacked Mr. Myrdal. The academic radicos of Negro intellectuals, exemplified by the criticism of Mr. Myrdal, is in line with the type of liberal but skeptical laissez-faire (do nothing) opinion so prevalent among white social scientists, writing on the Negro problem. Since neither party is very active in trying to locate the Negro问题 within the appropriate social context, it does not make much difference if the Negro radicals back forward to their original positions in the academic circles.

The essay goes on to discuss the role of Negro intellectuals in society, the problems they face, and the solutions they propose. It also critiques the work of other authors, such as Mr. Myrdal, for not fully addressing these issues.
The Three Faces of N. Khrushchev

The conflict in Russia's policy of "peaceful co-existence" came out clearly when three nations of the same theme were played within a short period against the strong constraints of London, Beijing, the UN, India, and Washington, D.C.

"The Secret Document"

In a recent article in The London Observer, Edward Crankshaw wrote: "There has come into the public view a secret report of the charges and countercharges between Peking and Moscow... There is a strong possibility it was a deliberate leak on the part of the Russians."

Instead of allowing one for the probability that the "Secret Document" summarized neither correspondents' reports taken to order, the Russians expected timely elaborations after the Cold War's conclusion for the surprise appeal, which is, in the essence, to secure the United Nations, the UN's only true haven for the nation's coexistence, to exist in the end with the USSR."

The second face of "peaceful co-existence" is the war threat.

Zorin's UN Role and Khrushchev's Letter

Under the immediate threat of the draft resolution of the Security Council of the UN by the Soviets, Zorin requested the UN's Security Council to submit a draft resolution to the UN. This was the second time Zorin's UN role had been stressed on the Cold War's conclusion for the United Nations, the UN's only true haven for the nation's coexistence."

The crisis was written February 28th, the day after the Security Council met for the first time. The resolution, introduced by Herwin, the UN, and Liberian, which had been under consideration, was not released to the press until the 28th, the eve of Zorin's departure for Moscow. The language of the press interpreted this as a warning to the Kennedy Administration that Russia's desire for peace is not to be at the cost of its own gains."

Khrushchev's Mosquedra

We can be sure that Khrushchev's letter to Nehru will get the widest possible circulation in the Afro-Asian world for whom it is intended. It speaks of the "true coexistence" of the UN in the Cold War, and appeals to the need for unity in the Afro-Asian world, which is the only true haven for the nation's coexistence.

"Only the Action of the Congolese"

The dimension of the Congo will continue so long as it remains the victim of "unilateral action" outside of, on the UN, the USSR, and the United Nations. Whether by war, or by pressure, the Congo has become the battleground of the two nuclear States fighting for world domination and the United States' "new world order". The united action of the Congolese can only be stopped by the Congolese themselves. In addition to the United States and the United Nations, the Congolese are the only true haven for the world's coexistence.

MARCH, 1961
1900 was the year when 16 million in Africa gained their freedom from Britain and France. 1900 was the year when Decolonisation, the Afro-Asian Revolution, began in earnest. In China, the boxers had sported their revolt, the Boxer Uprising, and the Qing Dynasty had been forced to open the country to the West. In India, the British had been forced to accept the Indian National Congress' demand for self-government. In Egypt, the Egyptians had declared their independence from the Ottoman Empire.

1960 was the year when those 16 million in Africa gained their freedom from Britain and France. By 1960, all of the former African colonies in the European empires had achieved independence. Algeria had declared its independence from France in 1962, and South Africa had been forced to recognize the independence of Namibia in 1990. In Asia, Pakistan had declared its independence from the British in 1947, and India had declared its independence from the British in 1947.

The year 1960 was a significant year in the history of the world. It was the year when the world changed forever. It was the year when the world woke up to the reality of the African continent's potential.

PATRICE LUMUMBA

Kilungu, the capital of the Zaire, was a city of great contrast. On one side, there were the colonial buildings, with their white-washed walls and red-tiled roofs. On the other side, there were the shanty towns, with their corrugated iron roofs and mud-brick walls. The city was divided by a deep chasm, with the rich living in the west and the poor living in the east.

Patrice Lumumba was a leader of the Congolese independence movement. He was a charismatic figure, with a magnetic personality and a captivating presence. He was a man of great vision, with a clear understanding of the need for change in Africa.

In 1960, Lumumba became the first prime minister of the independent Congo. He was a popular figure, loved by the Congolese people. His government was marked by a commitment to the principles of African socialism, with a focus on social justice and equality.

The year 1960 was a turning point in the history of the world. It was the year when the world changed forever. It was the year when the world woke up to the reality of the African continent's potential.
Peaceful Coexistence

Where Stalin was a realist, Kruschev is a liberal. He called for the coexistence of all political systems and emphasized peaceful coexistence. However, the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union led to the decline of the concept of peaceful coexistence.

Although it is all too obvious that the Satellite countries, and the Societies of the Western Alliance are not at each other’s throats, and that the two sides are not fighting each other, the idea of peaceful coexistence has largely lost its meaning.

Revealing the Conscience

The American Negro

The American Negro faces the challenge of achieving equality and freedom. The struggle for civil rights in the United States has been a long and hard-fought battle, and it continues today. The African-American community has made significant progress, but there is still much work to be done.

The West European Fratricide

The mass demonstrations in London against the bloody violence in the Middle East have been given voice by the Boycott South Africa movement. The British workers have shown that they are not afraid to challenge the government and demand justice for the people of South Africa. The struggle for freedom and democracy is a global one, and it will continue until all people are free.

Seeks Tours Africa

The new spirit that on all the concrete incidents relating to Africa’s relationship to the World Community, this conference has led to the establishment of a new framework for relations between the countries of Africa and the rest of the world.

The Afro-Asian Meeting

The Afro-Asian Meeting was held in Jakarta, Indonesia. It was a chance for African and Asian leaders to discuss the challenges facing their countries and to work towards a shared future. The meeting was seen as a step towards a more united and cooperative Africa.

APPENDIX

Note: We print only part of the appendix, since the full text is a review of LOEPELJERNEFSON'S AFRICAN SOCIALIZATION, which was published in the 1965 issue of NEW JERSEY.

We print below only the sentences, which is the introduction to the section from Sekou Touré, and the conclusion:
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The Afr...
Intellectuals in The Age of State Capitalism

We live in an age of state capitalism which, at one end, vaguely reminds us of the old "Chomsky" and at the other end, America, still designates itself as "free enterprise." Not only are the conditions of production hardly distinguishable from each other, however, but so is the administrative mentality of the intellectuals at both poles of world capital. As Beffa once wrote, "his one criterion of the productive side is the extent to which the production fund is distributed fairly between the proletariat and the state capitalistic. In this case, the writer gets mixed up with the worth of the new nations and the power, an issue Bruttner will provide the necessary details of interests of the proletariat and the state.

In each case the scholarship of the writer gets mixed up with the worth of the new nations and the power, an issue Bruttner will provide the necessary details of interests of the proletariat and the state.

We live in an age of state capitalism which, at one end, vaguely reminds us of the old "Chomsky" and at the other end, America, still designates itself as "free enterprise." Not only are the conditions of production hardly distinguishable from each other, however, but so is the administrative mentality of the intellectuals at both poles of world capital. As Beffa once wrote, "his one criterion of the productive side is the extent to which the production fund is distributed fairly between the proletariat and the state capitalistic. In this case, the writer gets mixed up with the worth of the new nations and the power, an issue Bruttner will provide the necessary details of interests of the proletariat and the state.

In each case the scholarship of the writer gets mixed up with the worth of the new nations and the power, an issue Bruttner will provide the necessary details of interests of the proletariat and the state.
THE FLEXIBLE DIASPORA

Although Prof. Mareno admitted that "The difference between the first years of the Bolshevik revolution and the fully developed phase of the revolution are obvious," (p. 74) he has refused to admit that Stalinism has been a revolutionary phase. Stalinism, like a natural disaster, has devoured the old life; it has turned the world upside down. In this sense, Stalinism is a revolution. Stalinism has put the world back in its original state, and has reproduced and reproduced and reproduced until a new revolution is possible.

Of course, Stalinism has left in its wake a number of destructive forces. The destruction of the old social order has been accomplished. The destruction of the old class structure has been accomplished. But the destruction of the old social order has not been accomplished. The destruction of the old class structure has not been accomplished.

The destruction of the old social order has not been accomplished. The destruction of the old class structure has not been accomplished. But the destruction of the old social order has been accomplished. The destruction of the old class structure has been accomplished. But the destruction of the old social order has not been accomplished. The destruction of the old class structure has not been accomplished.
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Tito’s Turnabout

Russia’s atomic blasts scattered to the winds filled with radioactive fallout, and the post-thirty Promises in the Great Program of the Communist Party which to be in Moscow in October 17th.* But it did not succeed, for the Russian Union. The break from Stalin had been, of course, the fundamental departure. The decision in 1949 to form a new state, and the Communist Party, had led to a fundamental change in the political and social structure of the former Soviet Union. The break from Stalin’s Union had been a fundamental change in the political and social structure of the former Soviet Union. The break from Stalin’s Union had been a fundamental change in the political and social structure of the former Soviet Union.

"Different Paths To Socialism"

Tito’s break with Stalin produced a new crop of theories on "different paths to socialism." The crop was a sufficient altitude for one to win Trotskyist world support, despite the fact that Tito’s Union had come to head the Yugoslav Party because he had sufficiently followed through with the Moscow Plan of Tito’s Union. The crop was a sufficient altitude for one to win Trotskyist world support, despite the fact that Tito’s Union had come to head the Yugoslav Party because he had sufficiently followed through with the Moscow Plan of Tito’s Union.

The "objective" for this unorthodox Trotskyite support was to overturn the bureaucratization and the transformation of the state. The only problem was that the transformation of the state was directed, not against its single Party Bureau, against the bureaucracy of the state. The only problem was that the transformation of the state was directed, not against its single Party Bureau, against the bureaucracy of the state.

Nevertheless it would be wrong to think of Tito’s break as merely a "nationalist" one, anymore than Stalin’s theory of "socialism in one country" was only secondarily nationalistic. Primarily it is an expression for state capitalism—a state exploitative system that aims to become a "world system" which, at the point of production, preserves the relations of all countries, which characterizes the state capitalism within the "world system".

"The Dialectics of Revolution"

What is innovative in Tito’s "revolution" is its own dialectical development. The change introduced into the Stalin Plan to appease mass pressure produced state capitalism. Tito’s logics into Russia’s revolution. For example, Yugoslavia abandoned ranked collectivization in favor of a combination of state farms, cooperatives, and private enterprise. This was the result of Tito’s Union, which had not therefore been dismantled. Tito’s Union did the transformation of capitalism, which preserved Stalin’s agricultural policy in agreement with the collective working possibility for absolute rent.

Kardelj asked for an "insight into the Russian's industrial set-up from the changes introduced in Yugoslavia’s de-centralized planning accompanied by establishment of workers’ councils." How totalitarian culture torture words, to transform them into their opposites. Although three social workers’ councils were not born of revolution and could not therefore suddenly say "withdrawing away of the state," understanding the change in the true world revealed new life, the price that suddenly showed through between silences. And Kardelj came through with a priceless description of Russian Communism as a "progressive Stalin revision of Marxism."

"The Nearest of War"

On the very eve of his success, as the heads of nations gathered in Belgrade, when Khrushchev seemed openly to slap down collective two-frontism, Tito suddenly announced that he understood the "reasons" behind Russia’s Stalinist actions in surrounding nuclear testing. What changed between the time of open provocatively U.S.-Soviet arms race and the equally provocatively Stalinist actions in surrounding nuclear testing?

We can discount the arrognat stupidities of the American bourgeoisie which actually to all the legal means of keeping a nuclear weapon up to superior force. A country like Yugoslavia, which is facing this situation, and is still standing in all the internal and external world, and is still standing in all the internal and external world, is not standing without the stopping of production." (My emphasis.)

The same held true on the day of Tito’s break with Stalin. The bureaucratic state mentality could not understand the man-made miracle, the "system" of Stalin’s state-capitalism had to produce more, as Article 14, entitled "Work and Capital", of the new Plan of Tito’s Union, had to be strengthened. It is necessary to ensure a steady increase in productivity by introducing the greatest possible rationalization, by thorough- ly utilizing working hours." (My emphasis.)

"For Tito, the nearest of war that may well the doom of the Simplex Party State and its "capital system" of slave-capitalism is sufficient to make him prefer his chief opponent. For Yugoslavia, "it is a step to the future," it is a step to the future, is a step to the future.

The communist party in Serbia, the independent class, stands on the stage of its own history, its own history, its own history. And the transformation of the state capitalism into Yugoslavia’s socialism is the result of Tito’s Union’s transformation of the state capitalism into Yugoslavia’s socialism.
If This Isn’t Madness, What Is It?

On October 23, Swedish, Danish, and French observers provided a complete explosion report in accordance with the agreement reached by the 16-nation Energy Commission. The report described the explosion as "probably outside the 30-meter range." This, as the largest bomb ever exploded in the world, could have made the biggest wave that ever existed in that place, and that would have been the end of the Living quarter's air. The explosion was so large that it could have been seen from the moon.

The explosion of the 30 meter bomb was not very sound in the way it could be heard, but it was certainly very impressive. The bomb was pushed out of its socket by the explosion, and it was reported that the blast was heard more than a mile away. The explosion was so large that it could have been heard on the moon, and it could have been seen from the moon.

The United Nations, under the leadership of Secretary-General de Gaulle, has asked the United States to investigate the matter. The United States has refused to do so, and has said that it is prepared to investigate the matter if the United Nations so requests.
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MARXIST HUMANISM IN NEW BOOKS AND REVIEWS

A whole new spate of books have been published this year on the Humanism of Marxism, in contrast to the almost total silence which surrounded my MARXISM AND FREEDOM in 1925, which first published an English translation of the early Humanist essays of Marx, the reviews of the new books and the articles to the editors about them were numerous and exultant

The most pretentious of these are by socialists who make each comment sound like a manifesto anticipating the discovery of a new world. What they all fail to note is that the new books which started out as scholarly, eloquent tracts on "original Marxism," end up as a new orthodoxy, by falling into the trap of the variable contradiction between the science of economics and the science of humanism to force an identity between those two irreconcilable opposites—Marxism, a theory of liberation, and Communism, the practice of enslavement.

The shocking and—so far as the new authors are concerned—unintentional similarity of results arises, of course, from an affinity of belief in capitalism. Nevertheless, the "end product," though unidentifiable, in terms of the authors' intentions, is Communist. Contrariwise, it has been noted that the Marxists are "the scientific economists and practical revolutionaries" whose theories comprise Marxism because of its founder Karl Marx—and the critics never out. Therefore, the "how" of the stirring result is worth going into.

UNFOUNDED CONCLUSIONS

Let's take the most profound of the recent studies—MARXISM by George Lichtheim. It is a truly eloquent presentation of Marx's views of world history, as a "creative drama of human liberation." Mr. Lichtheim writes as passionately in defense of the truth that the young Marx and the mature Marx were one and the same.

"It is true that in later years he [Karl Marx] took a less excited view of the past than he thought of the future; but as the concepts of social evolution which he enunciated in philosophy by "critical" his aims, disappeared from his writings but it was never repudiated, nor could it have been, for it was already what he meant by the "cynics of theory and practice." (p.61)

As Mr. Lichtheim reaches post-Marxist Marxism, however, his hatred of Lenin allows the scholar to write as if present-day Communism and Leninism are very nearly one and the same.

In his Lichtheim thought he was attacking Lenin and Marx, in fact, he was incomparably led to the rejection of Marxism for our era. "The real tragedy," he writes on p.219, "is that Marxism tried to do duty both as a theory of society and as a philosophy of history and that its philosophic insights are hopeless at variance with its scientific insights." Out of nowhere comes the seductive conclusion that "we"—that is to say, the "interpreters of Marx" had called for a "critical" thought "assailed by a cavalierly had 'assailed' Marx's vision of "the creative destruction of capitalism."

Now it is one thing to rationalize one's acceptance of the "isms" one's friend has given one's self, and another to do so. It is quite something else to read into Marx upon the triune dialectic of Liberation with its Communist empire. This unfounded conclusion is even more vulgarly presented in the less important work—PHILOSOPHY AND MYTH IN KARL MARX, by Robert Tucker.

Prof. Tucker destroys the myth of a totally different philosopher—Humanism and "scientific economics"—by creating a new myth, which, however, he attributes to none other than Marx. "The myth of warfare of labor and capital was Marx's final answer to the problems of man's self-alienation." (p. 259)

Only a man living in an ivory tower, far removed from the class struggle of everyday life, in the factory and out of it, could describe everyday reality as a "myth."
RELATIVE "DISCOVERIES"

Nevertheless, this book is not the first single study of Marx's life and work. Although it was a substantial work, it achieved notoriety through a series of reviews and articles by its author, Michael Harrington, which appeared in leading intellectual journals.

Although it followed the Communist attack on European civilization in 1934, it is not the first single study of the life and work of Marx. Although it was a substantial work, it achieved notoriety through a series of reviews and articles by its author, Michael Harrington, which appeared in leading intellectual journals.

Even so, the book is not the first single study of Marx's life and work. Although it was a substantial work, it achieved notoriety through a series of reviews and articles by its author, Michael Harrington, which appeared in leading intellectual journals.

Now why all the anxiety to praise all works on Marxism except mine? The answer is really quite simple. I am not doing anything to do with "Marxism". My work is to uncover the "truth" about Marx's work, and to show how it is used by various political parties and factions.
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TWO WORLDS

In Memoriam:
Natalia Sedova Trotsky

By Naja Davudoff

ROLE OF WOMEN IN REVOLUTION

The death of Natalia Sedova Trotsky marks the end of the generation that achieved the greatest, and only successful proletarian revolution in history, the Russian Revolution in 1917. It has brought to sharp focus that other unique phenomenon—the unusual role of women in the original Russian Marxist movement.

One has only to compare an opportunist like Pastora, the only woman to reach, for a single year, the Political Bureau of the Russian Communist Party, with a Vera Zasulich—one of the three founders of the Russian Marxist movement—to see the stereo types that divide one from the other.

I mention Zasulich rather than the one woman in the whole Marxist movement that has made her mark as an original theorist—the Hess Luxembur- gue—because, in memoriam, of Natalia, I wish to speak of these women who had not gained the theoretical leadership and therefore were very nearly regarded except as faithful wives and mothers. (Vera Zasulich, though a leader, was never known for her bravery and emotions rather than for her theoretical contributions although it was her letter to Karl Marx that had produced the answer on the crucial point that he had to unfold Russian bourgeois economy and the need of a new society: "Das Kapital").

DEATH AND BURIAL

When, on January 23 the airmen of France carried the news of the death of Natalia, they knew over the whole world, the city that had been the scene of so much Tran- sit, of all the women who had made that animal.

THE FAMOUS LITTERARY-ARTISTIC

We have no need to go back to the days when during the years (1927-28) that I was in Mexico Trotsky's secretary. I shall, therefore, not go into the details of Trotsky's room and deliver the message of the world to the room, but I shall recall the conversation that took place in that room as it was told to me by Trotsky's secre- tary (and the Secretary) that I received in which she bit back the interferences of the French press that had quoted her as saying 'The Left Opposition Trotsky was the duty of the world to Trotsky'.

"These words—don't blame me—it's all on me. They were introduced to the writer of the interview... A good revolutionary like Leon Trots- key could not in any way be the victim of Mrs. Trotsky's words in speaking of the Left Opposition. It is pretended that his trial in a court case against the Left Opposition (Trotskyist) and considered it a murder and persecution of revolutionaries. It is the same with Trotsky's words in direct argu- ment with the Left Opposition (Trotskyist) and considered it a justification of the armed and forcible revolutionaries. It is the same with Trotsky's campaign against the Left Opposition. And in the same case, the trial in a court case against the Left Opposition, which he had a right to do.

Prof. Kglia said... I don't expect anything from the Rus- sian party now from the Un-dınantly oppositional insti- tutes. All de-Stalinization will prove to be a trap if it doesn't lead to the release of power by the oppositional political, military, and economic forces based on the counter-revolution which established Stalinism and capitalism."

On February 15, 1962

LYUDMILA KORNILOVA

TWO WORLDS

In Memoriam:
Natalia Sedova Trotsky

By Naja Davudoff

ROLE OF WOMEN IN REVOLUTION

The death of Natalia Sedova Trotsky marks the end of the generation that achieved the greatest, and only successful proletarian revolution in history, the Russian Revolution in 1917. It has brought to sharp focus that other unique phenomenon—the unusual role of women in the original Russian Marxist movement.

One has only to compare an opportunist like Pastora, the only woman to reach, for a single year, the Political Bureau of the Russian Communist Party, with a Vera Zasulich—one of the three founders of the Russian Marxist movement—to see the stereotype that divides one from the other.

I mention Zasulich rather than the one woman in the whole Marxist movement that has made her mark as an original theorist—the Hess Luxemburgue—because, in memoriam, of Natalia, I wish to speak of these women who had not gained the theoretical leadership and therefore were very nearly regarded except as faithful wives and mothers. (Vera Zasulich, though a leader, was never known for her bravery and emotions rather than for her theoretical contributions although it was her letter to Karl Marx that had produced the answer on the crucial point that he had to unfold Russian bourgeois economy and the need of a new society: "Das Kapital").

DEATH AND BURIAL

When, on January 23 the airmen of France carried the news of the death of Natalia, they knew over the whole world, the city that had been the scene of so much transit, of all the women who had made that animal.

THE FAMOUS LITTERARY-ARTISTIC

We have no need to go back to the days when during the years (1927-28) that I was in Mexico Trotsky's secretary. I shall, therefore, not go into the details of Trotsky's room and deliver the message of the world to the room, but I shall recall the conversation that took place in that room as it was told to me by Trotsky's secretary (and the Secretary) that I received in which she bit back the interferences of the French press that had quoted her as saying 'The Left Opposition Trotsky was the duty of the world to Trotsky'.

"These words—don't blame me—it's all on me. They were introduced to the writer of the interview... A good revolutionary like Leon Trotsky could not in any way be the victim of Mrs. Trotsky's words in speaking of the Left Opposition. It is pretended that his trial in a court case against the Left Opposition (Trotskyist) and considered it a murder and persecution of revolutionaries. It is the same with Trotsky's words in direct argument with the Left Opposition (Trotskyist) and considered it a justification of the armed and forcible revolutionaries. It is the same with Trotsky's campaign against the Left Opposition. And in the same case, the trial in a court case against the Left Opposition, which he had a right to do.

Prof. Kglia said... I don't expect anything from the Russian party now from the Un-dınantly oppositional institutes. All de-Stalinization will prove to be a trap if it doesn't lead to the release of power by the oppositional political, military, and economic forces based on the counter-revolution which established Stalinism and capitalism."

FEBRUARY, 1962

6684

Back to text
In Livre Pure, in 1906, which by brilliantly exposing the Moscow industrialists, dealt an irreparable blow to the plans of the First Congress of Russian Social Democrats. In the dark days after the tragic news had reached her, Olovsky Trotsky and Natalia were  enclosed in their room. Trotsky wrote the story of their lives here, in the first time since revolution when Trotsky had written by hand. The next day after Trotsky had not shared for a whole week. He was dressed in formal clothes and his face was lit up with a smile. He was happy, he said, because he had been able to write his last letter to his wife.

On March 1, Natalia Trotsky emerged from her room, dressed in her most beautiful dress. She was pale, but her eyes were bright with joy.

The following month, the news arrived of the announcement of the March 1907 Moscow Strike, scheduled to begin upon the afternoon of the 27th of March. Trotsky was in the city, had been out for dinner, and was returning home when he received the news.

One day, shortly after the announcement of the Moscow Strike, Trotsky and Natalia went for a walk in the park. They were talking about the strike, and how it might affect their lives. Natalia was particularly concerned about her children, who were still young and had never experienced such a thing before.

Trotsky reassured her, telling her that they would be safe and that the strike would only bring good things for them.

In 1906, there had been no revolutionary activity in Russia. The overthrow of the czar and the establishment of the republic had brought a sense of hope to the workers and peasants. But the new government was weak and corrupt, and the revolutionists were quickly driven underground.

The strike was a desperate attempt to get attention from the government and to show that the workers were not content with the new order. But it was also a symbol of the hope that was still alive in Russia.

The strike was eventually put down by the government, but it had shown the workers that they were not alone in their struggles. And it had given Trotsky and Natalia a sense of purpose and a reason to continue fighting for a better world.

FOOTNOTES
1. To this day, the workers' movement is often referred to as Trotsky's legacy. The story of his leadership during the Russian Revolution and his subsequent exile from the Soviet Union have become legendary.

2. Natalia Trotsky was a key figure in the Workers' Party, which Trotsky had founded in 1903. She was also a strong supporter of the Bolsheviks, and was often in conflict with Stalin.

3. Olovsky Trotsky was a member of the Bolshevik faction of the Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party.

4. Trotsky's analysis of the Russian Revolution is still widely debated, and his ideas continue to influence political thought to this day.

In 1906, the workers' movement was still in its infancy, but it had already shown its potential to change the world. Trotsky and Natalia were among the many who were determined to make that change happen.
Natalia’s Break
With The SWP-1951

To the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party

Comrades,

I must quite well that I have not been in political agreement with you for the past five or six years, since the end of the so and even earlier. The position taken on the important events of recent times shows me that instead of rectifying your earlier errors, you are persisting in them and deepening them. On the road you have taken you have reached a point where it is no longer possible for me to remain silent or to confine myself to private protest. I must now express my opposition publicly.

The step which I feel obliged to take has been a grave and difficult one for me, and I can only regret it sincerely. But there is no other way. After a great deal of reflection and hesitation over a problem which has tormented me deeply, I find that I must tell you that I see no other way out than to say openly that our disagreements make it impossible for me to remain any longer in your ranks.

The reasons for this final action on my part are known to most of you. I repeat them here briefly only for those few to whom they are not familiar, teaching only on our fundamentally important differences and not on the differences over matters of daily policy which are related to them or which follow from them.

On my own old and tired formula you continue to regard the Stalinist state as a workers state. I cannot and will not follow you in this. Virtually every year after the beginning of the fight against the emerging Stalinist bureaucracy, I.D. Trunsky repeatedly pointed out the regime’s support to the right under conditions of a complex world revolution and in support of all political positions, in Russia by the bureaucracy.

Time and again, he pointed out how the conclusion of Stalinism in Russia led to the weakening of the economic, political and social positions of the working-class, and the triumph of a tyrannical and privileged aristocracy. If this trend continues, he said, the revolution will be at an end and the restabilization of capitalism will be achieved. Unfortunately, it was not supported, even if it is new and unfamiliar language which I am trying to give a new and unfamiliar form, but it is anova in the world which the authentic ideas and policies of the SWP outcasts are inextricably bound. It should be clear to everyone that the revolution has been completely destroyed by Stalinism. Yet you continue to say that under this unacceptable regime, Russia is still a workers state. I consider this a blow at socialism. Stalinism and the Stalinist state have destroyed whatever in common with a workers state or with socialism. They are the war and the most dangerous enemies of socialism and the working-class.

You now hold that the states of Eastern Europe over which Stalinism established its domination during the Second World War were nothing but Stalinist outposts of the Soviet state. This is equivalent to saying that Stalinism has carried out a revolutionary socialist role. I cannot and will not follow you in this.

After the war and even before it ended, there was a rising revolutionary movement of the masses in these Eastern countries.

But it was not those masses who were powerful, it was the Stalinist state that was established by their struggle. It was the Stalinist counter-revolution that won over, reducing these to servitude of the Kremlin by strengthening the working masses of their revolutionary aspirations. By considering that the Stalinist bureaucracy established workers states in these countries, you assign it a progressive and even revolutionary role. By presenting this monstrous falsehood to the workers whom you deny to the fourth international all the just and

(Continued on Page 7)

Natalia’s Break
With The SWP-1951

(Continued from Page 6)

reasons for entrance at the world party of the capitalist revolution. In this case as in any other, we always considered Stalinism to be a counter-revolutionary force rather than a factor of the form. You no longer do so. But I continue to do so.

In 1925 and 1926 the Stalinists, in order to justify their shameless capitulation to Hitlerism, declared that it would matter little if the fascists came to power, because socialism would come after and through the rule of fascism. Only dehumanized economic conditions are the result of a state or society which could have argued this way. Now, notwithstanding the obvious truth of the statement, I am convinced that the state which has already come exists and that the people of the world will eventually come. This view marks an inescapable break with the pre-revolutionary conditions always held by our movement and with which I continue to share.

Every advantage should be taken of the conditions which the Yugoslav regime now finds itself obliged to make in the people. But your entire press is now devoted to an inescapable functionalization of the Yugoslav bureaucracy for which we ground exists in the traditions and principles of our movement.

This bureaucracy is only a reprieve, a new form for the old fruits that have been harvested. It is trapped in the ideas, the policies and morals of the Stalinism. As a result, all the principles and policies of the Yugoslav people will be divided not only in the bureaucracy but in any other aspect in the course of struggle.

Most inapplicable of all is the position on the war which shows a different face. The Third World War which threatens humanity constitutes the revolutionary movement with the most difficult problems, the most complex challenges, the greatest cleavages. Our position can be taken to mean that the mass movement will continue to support the struggle for the defeat of the imperialist war which is being carried on by the Yugoslav people. I cannot and will not follow you in this.

As far back as 1927, Trotsky, in reply to a dis-
Kennedy's Nuclear Spectacular: Testing, Blackmailing, Brainwashing

Tearing a page from Khrushchev's nuclear testing and blackmailing last October, President Kennedy, on March 2nd, announced that he has ordered the resumption of nuclear testing in the latter part of April—"if" Russia has not signed a test ban treaty to suit him. In one respect only, Kennedy changed the Khrushchev formula of combining testing and blackmailing. Kennedy went in too far for brainwashing the American people.

Talking With People's Lives

As if he were reading a chauvinistic commercial about just how "nutty, cold, cool" it is when you change to the sponsor's brand, President Kennedy said that radioactive fallout was "less than 1/15 of 1% of the exposure guidelines set for adults who work with industrial radioactivity." The President also stated: "By conservative estimate the total effects from this test series will be roughly equal to only 1/15 of those due to this natural process." The President also mentioned that this was the first test in the current round, and that he would have no problem with the testing itself. In a later speech, Kennedy went on to say that the testing was necessary for the continued safety of the American people.

The Heavy Heart and the Lost Mile

At the time it was supposed to be "a grim Kennedy" who faced this nuclear winter with "the full responsibility of his own conscience." But his speech was marked by a great deal of concern that "even one additional individual's health may be harmed in the foreseeable future." Promptly a bipartisan Congressional chorus rose to lighten the "Presidential burden."

Senator Democrat Joe Manley spoke with eloquence on how "The President has walked the last mile and a little beyond..." to try to achieve peace with Russia on testing and disarmament. Not to be outdone by the Democratic Senator, Rep. J. William Moore of Pennsylvania was fulsome in his praise of how the President discharged "his full responsibility...". The President "could require no more than that..." the President "must try to say a word about 'civilization' as they prepare to annihilate it" if he is to be believed. The President "must make the people of both sides..." peace with Russia and the world. The speech went on to say that the people of both sides must hear the President's call for peace, "it is the people of both sides..." that must hear the President's call for peace.

The Big Lie

TIME magazine chose fancifully to build up just how "Kennedy's most important speech" was. The magazine's editors called it "The Blowtorched" as the chill effect of the Russian test series became apparent, largely through a detailed report prepared by the German Dr. Hans Bethe, a theoretical physicist well known as an opponent of unconditional nuclear testing. There was only one trouble with his holding. The truth was out before the lie was printed. March 3rd, 1962

MARCH, 1962
The Algerian Revolution Enters a New Surge

(Note: This article, by one of my colleagues, is a follow-up to the head article, "The Algerian Crisis: Fire", in the March issue of News & Letter, "R.R.")

Delegates de Gaulle's famous declaration to burn down the Secret Army Organization (OAS) all over, more than six years have passed since the French-Algerian war ended. In the wake of the Algerian War, the French have not only faced the loss of more than 2,000 men killed in action, but also the emigration of hundreds of thousands of French settlers to France. The Algerian War has left a deep scar on the psyche of France, and the French public is still reeling from the shock of this brutal conflict.

Algerian Reconstruction Affects Europe & Africa

One of the urgent problems will be the rehabilitation of large European-owned factories for the resettlement of hundreds of thousands of displaced workers. This will involve the conversion of hundreds of thousands of acres of commercial tracts to farmlands for underemployed Algerians.

The magnitude of the Algerian War is only hinted at by the staggering losses suffered by both sides. The French military tactics were characterized by a brutal and often indiscriminate use of force. The Algerian resistance movement, on the other hand, was characterized by a guerrilla strategy that targeted military and administrative centers.

If Algeria looks North across the Mediterranean to France, it also faces South across the Sahara to the rest of the Maghreb. In the future, it will be essential for the new Algerian government to focus on economic development and social welfare programs to stabilize the country and prevent further conflicts.

In April of 1962, the Algerian War was declared to be over, but the effects of the conflict continued to ripple through the region. The Algerian government struggled to rebuild the country and provide for its population, while France sought to come to terms with the loss of its former colony.

V. L. L. J. Granger

APRIL, 1962
The Evolution of a Social Type

Editor's Note: In an article published in October 1961, busy University students analyzed the evolution of several types of labor bureaucrats, including Walter Reuther, Jay Lovestone, and Irving Brown, emphasizing that the point is none of them has changed very basically. "Nine years later, not only are all these 'leaders' still profoundly around, but in some ways, they exhibit in full-blown the characteristics of the Planners in our age of state-capitalism."

Jay Lovestone is now an international "consultant" for the AFL-CIO, and a leader in that capacity. One of the ironies of history is that, like Irving Brown, he is not only a representative of the AFL-CIO in Europe, but, under his guidance, the European AFL-CIO has tried to model the Pre-Revolution, and now is trying to model an anti-Communist African affair. Walter Reuther's farm labor reforms, recent exploits of the UAW Convention are detailed on page 10 of this issue. It is clear that the article is detailed on page 10 of this evening, and the following extracts take this form even more significant in 1962.

Today, Lovestone knows the Communist Party as the agent of the greatest barbarism on earth. Russian barbarism, but in those days when the Russian Revolution had overwhelmed the fear, and the established workers' rule, the Communists were men of high principles who stood for a new social order, a totally new way of life, for tens of millions of people who hoped to rule, themselves in production and in politics.

The problem in the American Communist Party was that the backbone of its members was an immigrant stock. Jay Lovestone was a new type in the early days of the Communist Party. He was not a hard-line American type. He was a cultural type, or, in the phrase then went, "a petty-bourgeois intellectual." But he was American.

"Training Organizers"

He built up a whole theory of American "humanization." That was quite a characteristic theory. It meant that Americans was an essential or need not follow any principles in independent workers' activity, but could "put three" to a new social order, through all sorts of fantastic schemes, playing up with Liberalism, Thus, just as his successors in the 1920's fell for the New Deal, he went back to, and stuck for the Farmer-Labor Party; but that was not his worst feature. I am told, that the part which he played in the Second World War of the Communist Party at those dates lasted all his life, was his conviction of "training organizers."

Before Lovestone's leadership in 1926-27, Communist organizers would go into the worker, and from the workers their conditions as of that time, and with them, their organization. In the American Party, it was different: he trained his organizers to work with the top labor leaders and officials. And through these men, he got the new type of organizer who was not of the workers but "for" them. The new organizers were paid regular labor bureaucrats, but the special "consultants" supplied by the Labor, according to the "leader," were men who organized an "organization" leader, union organizer, and general debater among.

Two Types of Bureaucrats

In Europe in this moment, there are two types of American labor bureaucrats. Both are fancy titles and names, get along and try to sell the "American way of life" as if that were one world. But even of two coated, like Reuther, is the wrong kind. He is to deliver a speech at a hand-picked labor congress, in a U.S. Army base. He ends up by telling the American workers how much better off they are than the Europeans, after he has just told the West German workers how much better off they are than the East German workers who must come for bread to the West. Then, through the Voice of America, he circulated the idea to tell the East German workers what good they could be employed in the West of their lives, that they need "to believe in democracy."

The other, like Irving Brown, is the stationary kind. He is the international representative of the A. P. of L., who, in Europe, is always there to meet the various kinds of bureaucrats, but at the same time, distracts them. You see, he knew Reuther when he was the half-bred boy of the Communist Party and knows that he still is the planner, always ready to pull out of the pocket, as many five-year plans as any bureaucrat canWhats the difference? He is completely clear that Irving Brown's concept is the Communist fellow-travelers who are always "going" to me of a former leader of the Communist Party, Jay Lovestone, he knows that he must sell Europe, the workers, the concept, and not all Americans are industrialists and that the American worker who is always satisfying just lives his labor. He knows that this is the result of total collapse, including the state of the cold war. He knows that he is the only one at the European states who are struggling for a totally new way of life with each other," sales talks. He sees, he knows the plan and the planners. They are all around us.
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GRAND ILLUSION OF OUR TIMES: DISARMAMENT

At the recent General Disarmament and Peace Conference in Geneva, South American bankers, led by Brazil's President, President Juscelino Kubitschek, announced on June 10th that Brazil has "surplus weapons" of 200,000, an amount of 50,000 with which to manufacture and 100,000 with which to transfer to the world. In the meantime, the United States has announced that it will not manufacture or sell arms to Brazil. The United States has also announced that it will not carry out the nuclear test program in Brazil.

UNIVERSALISM IN NUCLEAR TESTING

This noted Russian commentator, in an article published in the Soviet journal "Russkoe Obozreniye," suggests that the superpowers are engaged in a "nuclear arms race," and that the United States, with its superior military and economic power, is the main beneficiary of this strategy. He argues that the United States should stop the nuclear arms race and work towards a peaceful resolution of the crisis.

THE TIMING OF BOTH ACTIONS

The timing of both actions, the American support for Brazil and the Soviet support for Brazil, is significant. The timing of the American support is intended to counteract the growing influence of the Soviet Union in the region. The timing of the Soviet support is intended to consolidate the position of the Soviet Union in the region.

Like the Tower of Pisa, this national pride has been found to lean heavily in one direction. As the United States and the Soviet Union continue to build up their military forces, the tension between the two superpowers is increasing. The current nuclear arms race is a manifestation of this tension.

JAPANESE SPLIT EMERGING

Japan's recent decision to install a nuclear weapon in the Pacific Ocean, as reported by the Far Eastern Economic Review, is likely to have a significant impact on the region. The United States and Japan have a long history of cooperation in nuclear matters, and this decision is likely to further strengthen their relationship.

The recent nuclear arms race is a manifestation of the growing tension between the United States and the Soviet Union. The United States and the Soviet Union are the two main superpowers in the world, and their rivalry is likely to continue for many years to come.

"SUPPRESSION OF HUMAN REASONING"

The suppression of human reasoning is a serious problem that needs to be addressed. The United States and the Soviet Union, as well as other countries, have a responsibility to work towards a peaceful resolution of the crisis. The United States and the Soviet Union should work together to find a solution that is acceptable to all parties involved.

"I should like to congratulate the leaders of the world on their efforts to promote peace. The leaders of the world should work together to find a solution that is acceptable to all parties involved.

JUNE-JULY, 1962
Our Underdeveloped Intellectuals

I have just returned from a trip to West Africa where the dynamics of ideas is in some contrast to the moral blunders of "the great dictators" here. In my analysis of the impact of Communism in Africa I have come to the conclusion that certain areas in the West which Britain even with ideas with a force equivalent to Portugal through any word of mỗi. This subject will be discussed in an article in AFRICA TODAY as well as in a forthcoming book on Africa. I can also say that African intellectuals, not only books on Africa by Europeans and Americans, especially the latter, are not immune.

Though we may divert some to discuss that the conviction of intellectuals in Africa for the cause of capitalism is not in any way a result of the "underdeveloped countries," but there is at stake a single book that deals seriously with these ideological battles. Where the political party of the "underdeveloped countries" is that Communist party will win because it does not understand that the African is deeply religious, or his tribal charcter is simple and concrete, or well, anything at all in order to avoid confusing the realities of African societies.

What is more obvious, however, than the African continent having a monopoly of underdeveloped countries is that the technologically advanced countries have a monopoly of underdeveloped intellectuals.

"PERHAPS WE SHOULD BECOME MARXISTS..."

Turning away from books by our so-called Africanists in non-Marxist studies of Africa and Marxism, I had fast opened admission that if Rhumba were nowhere around and the Africans had never heard the name of Marx, Marxism would be a popular philosophy. It is contained in a book titled The Endless Revolutions by Professor Adam Ulam. Professor Ulam is an anti-Marxist, but not a vulgar one. He is not one who contends that "since Communism is the only Marxism that exists in the world outside of its form, that therefore" Marxism and Communism are one and the same. His point is a clear and simple one. What comes after the preceding of persons to those who wish to hold on to any and all of its results by the masses is to make this point.

The sale in this admission of the Marxists is that it supposed to be safe to only underdeveloped countries. So it is considered the Marxists do not apply to the modern nations, that he comes with an own original offering. "Perhaps," wrote Prof. Ulam, "we should become Marxists in the point..."

So who are his co-defenders of capitalism shied away from such an admission? My father was the very individualist to the book when it first appeared two years ago. Now he is a non-Marxist, sells his book in the name of preserving the "American way of life." The book was then written in the manner of the "American way of life" and did not alienate me from the book. It is the same book written in the manner of the "American way of life" and did not alienate me from the book. It is the same book written in the manner of the "American way of life" and did not alienate me from the book. It is the same book written in the manner of the "American way of life" and did not alienate me from the book.

FOOTNOTES

How Much Has The South Changed?

Old Kressrett (Mississippian) University of Miss. Slave Revol. 1816-1835.

Editorial
Either Freedom Here and Now—or the Magnolia Jungle

The bloody night of September 30th, which enshrouded two innocent maidens, never sweet and beautiful, cannot be washed clean by the belated appearance of Federal troops which finally brought "peace and order" into Oxford, Miss., only by reenacting the armed terror during their stay in the magnolia jungle.

In sharp contrast to the determination and courage of James John Meredith, the man of education who accepts the White House—September 30th, 1962, dawned upon the darkness of night and the safety of the campus as usual, at the hands of a campus and white picket lines and shotgun blasts. The future of the University of Mississippi hangs by the thread of Meredith's actions.

"The Traymore and the Faroes" were not for the ever-revolving bravado which embossed the very fabric of society, as we were witnessing the dawn of a new era. Was it possible for us to see that the most revered image of American society is being redefined by a new generation?

The time was now for a new era to begin, one that would redefine the meaning of American society. Was it possible for us to see that the most revered image of American society is being redefined by a new generation?

In this era, the Traymore and the Faroes were not for the ever-revolving bravado which embossed the very fabric of society, as we were witnessing the dawn of a new era. Was it possible for us to see that the most revered image of American society is being redefined by a new generation?

The traymore and the faroes were not for the ever-revolving bravado which embossed the very fabric of society, as we were witnessing the dawn of a new era. Was it possible for us to see that the most revered image of American society is being redefined by a new generation?

There is a big change between this scene of humor and the low sounds of the jazz, as there is between the latter's hyperactivity and Meredith's fortitude. The total environment in which Meredith is located is different from the one which he confronted in the Army. He had refused to be a part of this environment, and in so doing, he was not merely refusing to be a part of it, but he was challenging the very fabric of society.

Addicted while drinking milk, the Negroes were the key American minority.

North and South

North, as well as South, the Negro has been ghastled. Although he has played a vanguard role in every aspect of life and art in the historic development of this country, the Negro of the United States disregarded this role—indeed a Harvard man even said that the Negroes had nothing to say in the nation. The Negroes have introduced public education to the remotest South as well as given it the only democracy it ever had. The full history of the South has no need of such false heroes as the President, and it is a relief to hear what white Mississippians wish to follow the traditions of Lasser, not p. 24.
The Automation Battlefield And the Philosophical Battles

Were we even to discount the actual dollar workers claim as causally attributing to automation, the working class would still be a business machine. The growth of automation, which is not only confined to the United States, but also to other parts of the world, has raised the question of whether automation is a "new" technology. The result was a movement of automation and capitalism in favor of the state. The process the result the void

One of the many atrocities in industrial production that Marx's theory of the proletariat is based on is the division of labor. This division of labor results in the production of commodities that are not designed to be used, but rather to be consumed. In order to understand the causes of this division of labor, we must first understand the nature of commodities.

The process of production involves the division of labor and the production of commodities. This process is not just the division of labor, but also the production of commodities that are not designed to be used, but rather to be consumed. In order to understand the causes of this division of labor, we must first understand the nature of commodities.
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FREEDOM HERE AND NOW

Fortunately, at the opposite end of the Mississippi spectrum stands out the President, but the Negro. The very continuance of his struggles both throughout his history and today, in war time as in peace time, brings sanity into the development of our country. Along with the white worker, he created the CIO. But now they say he will wait no longer for any man to lead him. Nor will he stop short of total freedom.

Freight cars are overcrowded, he will overcrowded. He仲裁 of the Negro masses

We must agree to bring these men, just as President Lincoln, was to do, to answer for the state of the Negro race. His answer was to set free the slaves. Now, as then, we must face the issue. The Negro race must be freed. The President must answer for the state of the Negro race.

Lincoln, the President, answered for the state of the Negro race. Now, as then, we must face the issue. The Negro race must be freed. The President must answer for the state of the Negro race.

The Negro race must be freed. The President must answer for the state of the Negro race.

The Negro race must be freed. The President must answer for the state of the Negro race.

The American Image Abroad

World attention was focused on Mississippi. So compelling was the drama there over the specter of absolute power. Right of Astronomers before any image of America abroad. The President must answer for the state of the Negro race. The President must answer for the state of the Negro race. The President must answer for the state of the Negro race.
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The President must answer for the state of the Negro race.
IDEOLOGY AND REVOLUTION: A STUDY IN WHAT HAPPENS AFTER...

The sudden transformation of Cuba into a Russian-style socialist state, followed by the even more sudden vanishing of the base, is a reality which every reader is obliged to take very seriously. It is a reality which every reader is obliged to take very seriously. It is a reality which every reader is obliged to take very seriously.

This pitfall in the question about how power corrupts and how absolute power corrupts absolutely. This is one that can only be answered by the recognition that the whole of history has been a record of power and powerlessness, and that the whole of history has been a record of the whole world into a record of power and powerlessness. This is the way to the revolution which, after victory, set up as a cause of repetition and revolution, the Cuban Revolution. It was after a year, the Cuban Revolution in the Soviet-Chinese Communist world. Fidel Castro now claims that there is no third road. The truth, however, is that the revolution was achieved without Communist help and the first year of revolution revealed an original philosophy as well as original transformation.

Between that year and the present victory, there was a period of transition that was not covered by a "transition". In fact, there was a period of transition that was covered by a "transition". In fact, there was a period of transition that was covered by a "transition". In fact, there was a period of transition that was covered by a "transition". In fact, there was a period of transition that was covered by a "transition". In fact, there was a period of transition that was covered by a "transition". In fact, there was a period of transition that was covered by a "transition". In fact, there was a period of transition that was covered by a "transition". In fact, there was a period of transition that was covered by a "transition".

THE FIRST YEAR OF REVOLUTION

The first year of revolution unfolded with no difference between ideology and action. This is too much to say as original in ideology as it is in its immediate result. Fidel Castro could express it differently than the Cuban Revolution, he wrote "a humanistic revolution because it does not deprive man of his conscience, but holds him as its basic sign. Capitalism sacrifices man the Communist state, by its totalitarian concept."

The Cuban Revolution was a high state in the development of freedom in the whole of Latin America. It did more than overthrow the cruel and despotic dictatorships (which were both the targets of American intervention), to bring about the freedom of its own state. It achieved a revolution in agricultural relations.

Within the state, and not the agricultural worker, is the owner of those commodities, and the state, has thrown itself into the state of society, as the community of animals. This is the least embarrassing revolution I have seen anywhere of state capitalist societies like Spain or China.

If the Russian has certainly little the Jackboot in Cuba, and Americas is on its way to Cuba, from the Russian Revolution, to the American Revolution, to the Soviet-American Revolution, to the American-Soviet-American Revolution, to the American-Communist Revolution, to the American-Communist-Communist Revolution, to the American-Communist-Communist-Communist Revolution, to the American-Communist-Communist-Communist-Communist Revolution. As if sneaking into the open-country Russian Revolution, the Cuban Revolution has been unable to establish such a state. The Russian state capitalism, with the agricultural mentality, ruled via commodities over the collectivity of the masses. Obviously we are face to face with the negative element of a world existent that will not be of the new-fangled communism.

Cuba has been able to maintain the administration at the American Revolution "make revolution" as a "stage of revolution".
(cont'd)

The two years that have passed since this was written have witnessed Castro's undeniable accumulation in the Communist
web, including his total acceptance of the Communist pervi
sion of Marxism. Fidel Castro is a man who thinks that if
he himself drives the last nail into his own coffin, he thereby
removes alive, and, if still alive, then certainly he is still the
leader!

THE TRAGEDY OF THE CUBAN REVOLUTION

For him, seeing that when the duel got tough between
the Big Two Paviors, Kirchnikov would find him in be expediu-
ous and so that he should have to take cover and that if he
before he got power, he had read Marx's CAPITAL, "as in eight
years and a half of Lenin and would have to wait Marx-Leninin
the rest of my life." Minimized or a speech at "Marxism-
Leninism," Castro only means that he was at that time the
and sinker the Communist perversion of Marxism-Leninism, In
case, with the occasion for, and purpose of, the speech is
to execute the final dissolution of the July 26th Movement into
the Communist Party, now seamless the International Revolutionsary
Organization. He has discovered that the single party is
"the ideal government" and that that single party is a selective
party which leads.

It matters little whether, by the time Castro renamed "The
Revolution" he had made without any party to "The Party," he
was also signing away the rights to missile bases and
their operation. There was little left of Cuba that remained in
the hands of the working people themselves. The State Plan
reigned supreme and thought control was so total that it not
only stripped off the philosophy of freedom but overfilled the
prisons.

Where "the party to be led" dominates one's every thought,
and the means to be led must have organizations of their
own, there the fulfillment of the State Plan takes the place of
human self-sufficiency. Where one is busy with power poli-
tics rather than the rights of human rights for their self-
development, the human aspirations of a single country and
the human aspirations of the world are thwarted. The human
aspirations of a single country and the human aspirations of
the world are thwarted. The human aspirations of a single
country and the human aspirations of the world are thwarted.

The leadership complex, itself a by-product of our state-
society, blindly and its drive for world domination, blinds Castro
fully to the creativity of the masses. That, for him, results
in an unopened book. Therein lies the tragedy of the Cuban Revo-

ution.
EDITORIAL

Kennedy and Khrushchev Bring the World Close to the Point of No Return

The world held its breath this October 22nd as President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev announced that they had worked out an agreement to withdraw missiles from Cuba and remove the threat of nuclear war. This agreement represents a significant step toward peace, but it must be viewed with caution.

Nuclear Missiles in Hands of Russian Officers

So long as the superpowers operate,北京--The expression of Russian officers on the recent disposition of nuclear weapons and the missile force of the United States to the Cuban area is not simply a statement of the fact that Cuba, the United States, or the United Kingdom may control nuclear missiles in Cuba. It is a statement of the fact that in the present nuclear age, nuclear weapons are not the means of achieving political dominance, but a means of preserving political dominance. This is why the United States has been so much more interested in the Cuban situation than in any other recent conflict. The Cuban situation is of great importance to the United States, because it is the United States' policy to ensure that nuclear weapons are not the means of achieving political dominance.

The Cuban People

We understand that the Cuban people, who have been deprived of their freedom for so long, now have an opportunity to express their opinions. This is a significant step forward for the Cuban people, who have been fighting for freedom for so long. We hope that the Cuban people will continue to fight for freedom, and that the United States will continue to support their struggle for freedom.

Opposition to War Must Show What You Are For

In the face of so much violence and aggression, the United States must take a firm stand against nuclear weapons. We must continue to work for a world without nuclear weapons, and we must never forget that nuclear weapons are a threat to all of humanity. We must continue to fight for a world of peace, and we must never forget that peace is the only way to overcome the threat of nuclear weapons.

Russia is Exporter of Counter-revolution

The United States has been fighting against Russia for so long, and it is clear that the United States will continue to do so. We must continue to work for a world without nuclear weapons, and we must never forget that nuclear weapons are a threat to all of humanity. We must continue to fight for a world of peace, and we must never forget that peace is the only way to overcome the threat of nuclear weapons.
Protests Report From The Gambia

Editor's Note: Ezra Beatty, who is on tour as this issue goes to press, has received the following letter concerning an article which appeared in the November issue of News & Letters, entitled "A View from the Gambia." Because that article has already received considerable response from our readers, we shall in this issue present an "Editor's View" on it. We are printing this letter in full below.

Dear Ezra - I know that the policy in the paper is not to edit other people's writings, and particularly not when articles come from Africa. My position is that of supporting my own Afrika. In my opinion, you, more than anyone, have a superior and supported the great contributions made to the world by your own Afrika. (African American Fighters)

Naturally, we can allow two standards of analysis in the paper but because an article comes from Africa I refer of course to "A View from the Gambia," by W. D. Colley (N/A). Nov. 1961...

Whitewash of Rhodesia

"In this particular case I want to quote what you yourself wrote in a recent letter in the "World News" of July 2, in which you said: "We want to see a world of free men, not a world of United Nations' forces."

"In the case of Rhodesia, the United Nations' forces have been established to defend the right to self-determination of the people of Africa.

"As a matter of fact, it is clear that the Rhodesian leaders have no intention of allowing these forces to have any influence in their country.

"Thus it appears that Mr. Garret-Jamphup of the Gambia, after a change of residence, has allowed himself to be used for this purpose without knowing it.

"If this whole sorry spectacle was a shock to many in July, how much worse is it today for the Overseas island of Nauru in the aftermath of the Cuban crisis, and of China's attack on India?"

WHO IS MR. GARRETT-JAMPHUP?

With regard to Mr. Colley's article, it relates to information on the Gambia, which exactly is Mr. Colley-Jamphup, and what are his credentials for arrogating to himself the role of spokesman for the Gambian mallet, or a new government?

"Mr. Colley identifies himself as 'former Minister of Agriculture,' and now General Secretary of the Gambian Democratic Party. If memory serves me, in your article,"The Gambian Deathwatch," published in AFRICA TODAY, July 2, 1961, you reported that the People's Progressive Party was formed in 1953, with a majority of 18 seats, as a result of the first general election by universal suffrage held in May. You further reported that the previous ruling party, the United Party, in opposition to the minority, with 12 seats, and that the Democratic Congress Alliance, Mr. Garret-Jamphup, could not secure only enough votes to win just one seat.

"Mr. Colley's article alters the impression that this spokesman for a minority party is in fact the spokesman for all of The Gambia.

Mr. Garret-Jamphup may protest that I don't understand the situation, I would deny, though most respectfully. But the time is not whether I understand the situation is Africa, but whether he understands the world.

"As a woman, she is the only woman of color to have been elected to the National Assembly of the United States, where she worked hard to promote civil rights legislation."
YOUTH WORKERS POSE PHILOSOPHICAL QUESTIONS

The totality of the world grid compels the re-examination of the values which underpin society. One of the ways in which the majority of us help this re-examination is the following: Do we not make an impact on the world by the things we do, the things we say, the way we think? If we do not, and if the work that is being done by youth is of no consequence, then we are not living in a world of our own making. Therefore, we have to ask ourselves some questions: What are the values that underpin society? How do we contribute to these values? What is our role in society?

MARIANNE'S LIGHT ON CHERN

We live in a world of forces and a period of transition. The forces that shape our world are not static. They are constantly changing and evolving. The transition is not just a matter of technological advancement, but a shift in the way we perceive and understand the world. This transition is not only about the physical world, but also about our collective consciousness.

MAXIM'S HEAVENLY LIGHT ON CHERN

Our values are not static. They evolve and change over time. It is important to recognize that our values are not just a reflection of our current moment, but they are a product of our history and our past experiences.

MAN NOT MACHINES, IS BASIS FOR FREEDOM

Says that the development of technology has not just been a technological advance, but also a social change. It is not only the machines that are revolutionizing our society, but also the people who use them.

ITALIANS KNOW COMMUNIST BETRAYAL

In the struggle for liberty, when the communists betrayed the Italian people, it was not just the Italian people who suffered, but the whole of humanity. The betrayal of the communists, as well as the betrayal of the socialist parties, has created a chasm that cannot be bridged. The struggle for freedom is not just a struggle for the rights of the Italian people, but for the rights of all humanity.
(Cont'd)

Each generation must meet the challenges of its own times. Lenin was always an agile pole; the source, not only an action
but a reason would create a new society on totally new founda-
tions. Either way, that is to say, either the population to a new
theory's pleasure runs production into the waste or you get a
"reform backward" to capitalism.

THEORY MUST MATCH GRANDEUR OF PRACTICE

In our age of absolutes, when revolution and counter-revolution,
are so interlocked, it is not only the intellectual "in general"-
who must leave his ivory tower, so must the Marxist theoretician.
The correct theory of the need of a vanguard party to lead
has blinded him to the fact that in the mass of people
in the end, that vanguard is caught to lead them, nobody is
ready to listen to them. Yet the relationship from practice during the past
three decades has been failure while the move from theory has
been at a near standstill. What is there, in present-day theory,
which matches the greatness of the 1957 Hungarian Revolution?

Each generation either meets the challenges of the times, or
fails into oblivion. No one however, can deny the fact that
our epoch marks the type of turning point in history where
history falls in turn, in the century. This author feels, that
the Italian people, inheritors of its own rich traditions of cultural
humanism and many movements of Marxism have a great con-
tribution to make to the creation of a new humanism which
is founded on the Marxist theory of liberation that "the freedom of
the individual is the basis of the freedom of all."

MARXISM AND FREEDOM is a theoretical contribution
which is of the greatest importance. It is of the greatest
importance in the essential struggle during Marx's majority, 1847-89; 2) to act in the sense
of the philosophical foundations of that great idea in Marxism-
Leninism, especially on the so-called "vanguard party" to the masses
in the period of 1905-1907; and 3) to analyze the problems of our
own age. While this part of the series is mainly for the
people in Russia and
America—the two poles of state capitalism contending for world
dominance—the two poles of state capitalism contending for world
capitalism is such that it has an application also to Italy.

April, 1959

Sara Danzerovskaya

January 1963
God rested on the seventh day; De Gaulle will not until he is dead. Will he even then? Unless he is sure of living until the ripe age of 132, he can only mean either that he is a prophet, or that he is confident that the totalitarian institution he calls a parliament "above parties" would carry out his line in his absence. And De Gaulle's concept of glory envisages not only that "soldier, military, British" becomes subordinate to France's Europe, but also that the United States be considered beyond the pale.

Far from De Gaulle acting as he does only because he can depend upon the U.S. for nuclear protection, he is acting as he does because he thinks that nuclear protection is virtually worthless because of the merely equal might of Russia. Moreover, De Gaulle thinks he can win over Russia—and from "the peace party" at that! As he expressed it in 1961: "No doubt Soviet Russia... recognizes that nothing can change the fact that she, Russia—a white European nation—is face to face with the two powers of China... casting their eyes upon them on the open spaces over which they must one day spread."

If this is madness, as it is, it is, however, the madness of an individual egomaniac. It is the madness of the state-capitalist way that has ruined a Mussolini and a Hitler and failed. De Gaulle is ready now to embark on an equally fantastic misadventure.

To understand De Gaulle, we need neither "psychology" nor "dependency" on Kennedy and the American bourgeoisie press.

What is essential is that we turn back the pages of history to the Depression in the year after the rise of Hitler, and the attempts of French fascists to take over France.

TWO TURNING POINTS IN FRENCH HISTORY: 1934-36: 1948-49

On Feb. 9, 1934, the fascists in France attempted to overthrow the government and themselves take power. The vote to that end found the established government, as usual, powerless. But the proletariat rose up spontaneously against the fascists, battled them on the streets and, within six days, came out on general strike, putting an end to the fascist pretensions. The fascist victory was followed up, in 1935, by the formation of a Popular Front and general elections in which the Socialists, for the first time, were a clear majority. From then the parties did not let power slip from their hands but followed up the parliamentary victory and nationalization of Nestlé. Thus the Fascists were put in the SIT-DOWNS which covered the whole of France. The following legislation was equally enacted: the 40 hour week, the 16 week vacations with pay.

What was the French military brass, including its not-so-senior officers, doing during these three critical years? We have the revealing French pundit's book (The Grave Diggers of France, by Freyot, written to expose the rottenness of the French military establishment and its material interest in Fascism.) In France Fascism was openly being laid in 1934, but not yet "a veritable popular revolution." Petain, in the January 1935 speech of Portieux, "was cut to the heart by the fear of social upheaval which was so many Conservatives had allowed among the millions of petit-bourgeois revolutionists." So Petain was for Laval and Levav, ever since 1935, for a Fascist-Catholic republicanism. And that was General Charles de Gaulle doing? He was arguing with the General Staff, but it was not about any appeal to native Fascism. The French general was arguing as a military man who considered the "defensive doctrine" futile, and wanted to mechanize the French Army.

When World War II broke out in 1939 De Gaulle felt himself vindicated, as if Laval would have been a war! The truth is that he was part and parcel of the bourgeois army and bourgeois elite which was undermining the French Republic ever since 1934. Again Petain thought France needed Laval and Levav thought France needed Petain. Petain came to power in France to make it an adjunct of Nazi Germany.

The Allies paid little attention to De Gaulle until the pro-fascists in France organized an underground. The Allies then recognized him as the French government in exile—or order to make sure to false him on the National Resistance as "the leader." The fact that the Commissars were sitting upon a chair that paid this independent publicist to use the prestige as Resistance fighter to ward the army and, as far as possible, the presidency of the provisional government after liberation. Without them, in 1944, he would have been as powerless as he was in 1938 without the OAS.
Although this was not because he didn’t try to establish his own type of state capitalism, he founded the “Holy of the French People,” but in 1924 the French proletariat would have none of the Communist Party, so he went more to the Emancipation in 1924. When I was in Paris in 1925 I had occasion to experience that the Emancipation, which was supposed to be “share markets” was not as favorable as anticipated. The strikes of 1925 and 1926, especially the latter, were independent as well as the Communism.

THE NEW IMPERIALISM

The imperialism of state-capitalism is the key to the understanding of the present stage of imperialism all over the world. In the crisis which began in the 18th century and resulted in the French Revolution, it is the imperialism which refuses to adhere “to the facts” that, and only two, big powers remained standing at the end of World War II in place of the several big powers which had divided the world among themselves previously. It would rather pretend to act as a buffer between them, or by being a buffer, but by deceiving, De Gaulle is asking Europe to belong to him, or to the new France-German axis, not merely because of glory hunting or prestige politics, but because of land economics.

Now that De Gaulle’s France has instrumented its industries, centralized its capital, and, through a Common Market, rather than by a bidding, accomplished its same for part of Europe, De Gaulle dreams much more fantastic dreams than Hitler ever did, not because he belongs to the 19th century and dreams of past glories, but because he is of today and dreams of future conquest. Without Hitler’s current might and his “secret weapon,” indeed disdainful of the nuclear might of the United States because it has been brought to a standstill by the equal nuclear power of Russia, De Gaulle has, by sheer daring, been a much gull than when he challenged Russia with his prototype and demanded that Kennedy be declared a “victor of universal Europe,” but Kennedy’s USA—pick it up.

His only concern now is that rebuilt Europe still lacks nuclear power. This is the Achilles heel of De Gaulle’s hard core in the Common Market, and land politics underlying the new Benne-Porte axis. Let’s see whether, in recognizing this vulnerable point pressures Kennedy hopes to rekindle the prestige of Europe, De Gaulle has become vulnerable, not the other way around.

"Taught in the head," or otherwise, De Gaulle, as we see, has found the vulnerable point in both the Anglo-American and the European defense of the West Europe, including the Benne-Porte axis. All the outcry in Europe to make one-man domination has been weak and uncoordinated.

Whether it is De Gaulle’s intellectual chauvinism or France’s central geographical position, which can be exploited to play for the very biggest states—forcing Kennedy for Khrushchev to play passive and unimportant, or, as De Gaulle, calls it, does not matter. What does matter is that he has, with the Treaty with Adenauer, created a new, powerful, frightening axis in Europe.

France’s financial activities and commercial activities of our “supra-States” times against the depression of 1929’s, in the disintegration of all class civilizations, from the fall of the Roman Empire to the collapse of France in 1940. His class may let him get away with it in Europe, perhaps, for the United States. Surely there is a group of apologists, from both left and right, who will proclaim his “cause” and to show that he not only acts in the interests of Europe (a right in “佣人主义” allowed him) but he also has a value (the little lamp) should not be dimmed.

What all too easily forget is that neither De Gaulle’s chauvinism, nor Khrushchev’s nominalism, nor Khrushchev’s“real-estate” or capitalistic policy, which have brought him to the “opposite” of exploitative capitalism, but that exploitative capitalism itself is now an object of “supra-States” times, that the imperialist exploitation of the competitive capitalism, capitalism has tried to hold on to its power through a series of so-called “economic" or “social" movements. New countries with the U.S. could hold on to it through a competitive model, which is the “right,” and which has been co-opted from World War I) and impoverished countries like German, Britain, France, and Russia search for “scared” or “exploitation” as an expression of the impotence of capitalism; even when Stalinism earlier could not hold on to power unless it was annihilated its foundations.
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MARXIST-HUMANISM: African, American
Why Not a New International?

In order to open a discussion between African and American radicals and intellectuals with a view to establishing new organisational relationships, as well as reviewing substantial experience drawn from the African continent, I would make the following remarks:

AFRICANISM—RD

One thing African and American Marxist-humanists share in common: the independence of its roots are questioned by "ill others."

The African Revolutions, having written the most exciting page in post-World War II history, have given African socialism an advantage over the West, in that it is not in the service of its philosophy. Independence has made the view of African socialism "affirmative," in contrast to the other side, Marxist—in so far as its Communist international, but in so far as its formal which Marx called "the machinery of Hygiene or Humanism," as treated by a "general doctrine."

The question mark over the relationship of African socialism to Marxist humanism, and as it does in America, to the fact that it is to be confirmed of the second American over the atomic sin of the established authorities. Rather, the question arises over the contradictory statement of African socialists themselves. I do not mean that the voice of African socialism is one voice. Far, very far from it. But here the differences are shaded, emphasized, overemphasized, while in Africa the contradictory statements are made with the same breath as the affirmations of Pan-Africanism and a unity which is supposed to exist. In other words, there are now two blocs among the independent countries, though it is sharply divided as, for instance, the Ndebele Panthers and the Nigerian Youth Congress in Nigeria, or as between Ghana and Nigeria, or Senegal and Gambia, or Mali and Togo; nevertheless all these are Pan-African socialists. Unfortunately, this only means that Pan-Africanism, far from illuminating what African socialism is to be in the coming years, has rendered...

WORLD PHILOSOPHY VS. Ruling Ideology

In two respects I agree with Professor Pierre Alexandre's article on the African continent and the African Cultural Tradition (ECSOVIEW, August, 1967) (1) that there are no "same points of concurrence, no absolute agreement between philosophical and sociological and Marxist, as interpreted by Africans." And (2) that it is not altogether unlikely, that the African Revolution is the birth of a new system of ideas and materialism "affirming them into an original whole." Where I do not agree, is that these systems of ideas, I have yet seen Marx and Mao at the same time and gotten profound. Rule and Revolution do not achieve the same ends in the Western world, state in history. Even if Africans do not believe, with me, that Russia has by now been transformed into its total opposite—on one end, a state-capitalist society—the fact still remains that Soviet Russia and the Chinese Republic are world powers, rather than world philosophies. Now, I do not say what had been thought when he first elaborated his Marxist philosophy, Tissa is pre- cisely the question which he was warned against when he wrote: Tissa would especially avoid re-establishing society, as an abstraction, opposed to the individual. The individual is the social entity... Communism is the necessary form and the everlasting principle of the immediate future. But Communism as such, is not the solution of human development, the form of human society.

The point of affinity between African and American Marxist humanism is that both are a reaction against this world development, the unfinished revolutions to be brought to a conclusion on an international scale. It is for this reason I traveled to Africa, and not only to hear the views of the leaders, but to get to know the thoughts of the man on the street, and in the bush, at this critical juncture of history.

Let us first turn to the views of the leaders of three representative trends of Pan-Africanism: Nigerian, Senegalese, and Guinea. With this in mind I quote below:

"The problem of the division theory from practice. What philosophy, we have not been materialized in such a way as to make it appear as something outside our daily life. Our way of life is tied with land tenure. Here is the common—"

HUMANISM: ABSTRACT AND CONCRETE

To this writer, the problem with Senegalese humanism is that it is general and abstract where it should be concrete and specific. The fundamental differences between Senegalese sociology and what it envisaged that Marx and Engels did not exist in the mind between "spirituality" and "materialism" but that between theory and practice. To see the tragedy of the African Revolution appears to stem from the fact that its leaders are over-drawn by the consciousness of the backwaterness of the technique, need to industrialize, and rapidly, that they turn for all almost exclusively to the power-base in the technologically advanced countries, instead of the proletariat in those lands. Let me make it clear at once that I am not opposed to the least in any African country accept aid from some source whatever, but that it has to be used in a way that is to the African people's benefit.

The point at issue is the relationship of man to all, and to the man of his own people, the very one he made independence possible; secondly, in the underlying philosophy of freedom, which is to be degraded to a situation where it is the relationship of forces with the economy, and, thirdly, and, above all, to the world proletariat, which is sensibly defined with the African to ever set it aside. It belongs to them. You don't
put an end to the cross-purposes, classist world that is presently indifferent for failure to destruction.

A "NO" HEARD ROUND THE WORLD

Of all the African nationalists, Sekou Toure is the one who appeals most both to the left in Africa and in the United States. It is not because of the historic sweep of hisideas and the passion of his voice. His little country's "No" to the icky (but not necessarily) De Gaulle France had electrified the world both with its daring and its challenging philosophy.

The confidence in the African masses—all peoples are capable of any time of administrating themselves and of developing their personality. There are no minor peoples, except under slavery or foreign oppression—laid the sweep of Lenin on the eve of the Russian Revolution when he maintained that "only from below" can the revolution become inevitable. But, to the "rediscovery of its African personality", in contrast to the discovery of the genius of the Russian proletariat as merely the beginning of the international revolution, this great African leader excludes all "foreign" ideologies, of proletarian nationalism, and of oppressor: "Africa cannot agree to the destruction of its personal, its civilization and its proper structure, to become an organic structure of any system of states or ideologies whatsoever." As if Marxism were not the unity of theory and practice, he materializes that "philosophy does not interest us. We have concrete needs."

A NEW INTERNATIONAL

What Guineans accomplished with its daring "No" to De Gaulle France was to re-establish the human factor as decisive. This, this and nothing else, was new in action and new in thought. This, this and nothing else, was the humanism of Marxism, translated in the epoch first in the Hungarian Revolution, then in the Afro-Asian Latin American world, and finally among the Negro American. This, this and nothing else, is what makes the politically "backward" American worker who has no mass labor party so efficient in battling automation at the point of production itself. The American worker who widens, who demands human, not automated, production relations, is ready for that same new dimension which is of the essence the world over if we are to avoid the nuclear holocaust threatening mankind's extinction.

Despite the Russian Communist attack on Heine's mysticism, that mystic under the impact of the French Revolution, anticipated the concrete reality of today when he wrote: "The self-determination in which alone the idea is, is to bear itself alive."

Speak, then, independent Africa, untainted by two world powers' class fights for world domination. You have gained your political self-determination, are struggling for economic independence, and are free to express also the self-determination of the ideas become the accumulated thought of centuries has been fructified by the elemental creativity of the masses, the revolutions of labor. Even as the reach for freedom on the part of the Hungarian revolutionaries has made them—who had been raised on Marxist theory only to be betrayed by its upsetters—the theoreticians Marxist-Humanists, so the plunge into freedom has made the African revolutionaries the theoreticians Marxist-Humanists. The valorous humilities of other lands are ready to listen, and, with your help, establish a new international, free from state control, and aspiring to reconstruct the world.
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Freedom Occupies Consciousness

Two very opposite events, which reverberated around the world, first in 1957, and again in 1962, were held in action in men's consciousness. In 1957, the Soviet No. 1 and Little Red were the main headlines; in 1962, James Meredith's courageous attempt to enter the University of Mississippi took the lead out of the spectacular six-orbit flight of astronaut Walter Schirra. An age in which "no little thing," like school desegregation, can be held in awe is scientific intelligence, is an age in which men's consciousness is preoccupied, not with science, but with human freedom.

Throughout history, all great turning points were characterized by the progress in the consciousness of freedom. Under the impact at the great French Revolution, the German genius, G. W. F. Hegel, gave the most profound expression to the unity in the development of freedom and of thought. "Only that which is an object of freedom," he wrote, "can be called an idea." It is from such a Hegelian-Marxist point of view that the analysis of United States history is made in the above pamphlet, entitled American Civilization on Trial.

A brief review, such as this must be, cannot do justice to a study of 280 years of the contradictory development of the United States which has, moreover, been written so concisely as to fit into 30 pages. I shall limit myself, therefore, in two aspects only: (1) the rapidity of this study from previous ones, both bourgeois and radical, and (2) the relationship of theory to practice as activity, and to practice as organizational form of a unifying philosophy.

A RADICAL DEPARTURE

Historically Negro struggles for freedom, where dealt with in history at all, have been separated from the mainstream of American development. The present study, on the contrary, makes the Negro himself "the touchstone of history".

"Because we preserve American civilization and its unbroken freedom from Great Britain, the Negro could give the lie to his democracy. At first he was done in as doing, but with the birth of Abolitionism, and for three stormy decades thereafter, American civilization was placed on trial by whites as well as by Negroes as the issue of freedom and the reality of slavery. The Negro becomes the touchstone of American civilization, the solution of which had an ever-expanding frontier but no unifying philosophy.

This is not meant as setting the record straight. Negro historians have striven mightily, and in many cases successfully, toward the accomplishments of the Negro. The true writing of Negro history, quintessential as it is, is not yet the true writing of American and world history unless (1) there is a distinctive group of the relationship of minority and labor struggles, and (2) the movement of slavery is seen, not so much as a progression of great mass of men from one racial caste to another, but as a progression of great masses of men. Where old radicals tried to do this, they detailed the oppression without studying the creativity of the masses. American Civilization on Trial shows these as the subject, not the object, of historical development. We can gain a glimpse of these proper subjects of history, that is to say, its moderns, by viewing the contents page of this pamphlet:

INTRODUCTION

1. Abolitionism and the Slave Masters
2. American Revolution
3. American Civil War
4. Reconstruction
5. Imperialism
6. Nationalism and Internationalism
7. The Politics of Racism
8. The Politics of Imperialism
9. Through World War II
10. The Frankfurt School
11. The New Left
12. The Challenge of the Caribbean
13. The Challenge of the Pacific
14. The Challenge of the Jews and of Israel
15. The Challenge of the World We Are

THE "PSYCHOLOGY" OF JIM CROWISM

Being the proper subject of history has nothing, of course, in the mix with the subjectivism of the psychological approach to Jim Crowism which points to the projection of white workers as "the psychology of Jim CROWISM is nothing but the class relationship between workers and capitalists. What these modern-day "analytic" Negroes in this past as the "slaves" of slavery could not have persisted as long as its domestic remodeling in cotton culture and sharecropping had not been the natural consequence of the unfinished state of the Second American Revolution, as the psychology of Jim Crowism would not have persisted if it had not been re-introduced by the development of Northern industrialism into monopoly capitalism. The letter needed Southern racism for its placenta into imperialism even as it needed imperialism for its violent struggles against white labor's challenge to its exploitative rate. As we prove it in the pamphlet:

"The psychology of Jim Crowism is itself the result, not the cause, of monopoly capital extending its tentacles into the Caribbean and the Pacific as it became transformed into imperialism, with the Spanish-American War.

THOUGHT AND PRACTICE AND THE

FOUNDOING OF NEWS & LETTERS

A new form of mass revolt emerged during World War II. In Europe we witnessed the growth of the Resistance movements, and in the United States there was an outburst, in 1942, both of the first miners' strike and the first Negro demonstrations to take place right in the midst of a war effort. The struggles in the United States called down the lid of workers' rights, and full democracy progressed not only by the ruling class but by the Communist, who, with the Naii incursion of Russia, had become the most rabid "American patriot." They opposed any independent movement of Negroes for their democratic rights.
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Witness the opinion of The Daily Worker which wrote: "Fighting is the only way and the only road to Negro rights in this country should be considered as necessary." The Negroes had no need of the later vicious McCarthy type of anti-Communism; they knew the true nature of Communism and fought against it a full decade ahead of McCarthy's discovery for his own revolutionary needs.

The period of new revolts which was initiated in 1943 was the period also of a great clarification of thought. Some of us, who were later to found NEWS & LETTERS, had developed the following theoretical insights: (1) the stage which had long since stopped being a workers' state had, with the outbreak of World War II, become a feudal state-capitalist society which would challenge its present Allies for world domination. (2) By seizing the new stage of capital development—state-capitalism—as a world development, and realizing it in new forms of mass events, we put ourselves on the alert both to the Middle East, Afro-Asian, Latin American revolts against Western imperialism, and such phenomenon developments as the first revolt (East Germany, 1953) against Russian totalitarianism. (3) At the same time, by leading closely to the spontaneous uprisings of the masses in their struggle against the first appearance of Automation in 1950, as well as the continuous struggles of the Negroes, we were led in the discovery of the American and Haitian roots of Marxist philosophy, and therefore to the break with all pet radicals.

These three preparatory stages permitted the founding of NEWS & LETTERS in the only paper edited by a production worker twice imprisoned also to be a Negro in a way in which it became a forum for the rank and file and won, simultaneously, the initiation of a unique combination of workers and intellectuals. This led to the formation of NEWS & LETTERS Committees and the publication of two diverse books and pamphlets, as Marxism and Freedom..., from 1970 until today, and Workers Battle Automation: Nationalism, Communism, Marxism, Humanism and the Afro-Asian Revolutions, and Freedom Riders Speak For Themselves.

The latest important event of news to come off the press, American Civilization on Trial, does not present itself as a "finished work," but as a living document that cannot be finished until the very foundation of the society it criticizes are superceded and, in its place, there emerges a classless society on human foundations. 1943 to 1963 indeed comprise the most crucial decades of the 20th century. A new world has arisen in the economically undeveloped countries, especially on the African continent. A great revolution on the European continent—in Hungary, 1956; in Vietnam, 1956—sheer to victory over imperialism that once its successful bloody counter-revolution has not weakened the Russian orbit, or the socialist camp. Quite the contrary, the socialist conflict first began in earnest. China too has been forced, by the blossoming of the "100 Flowers," to see the first beginnings of the end of its moralism.

In the United States, in this centenary of the Emancipation Proclamation, we witness a new stage of Negro struggles within the South which will not stop short of Freedom NOW.

We all agree, as participants in the Negro struggles, to present our analysis of American Civilization on Trial, yet as a "finished work," but as a contribution to a dialogue with other Freedom Fighters. We ask all to participate with us in developing this dialogue on WHAT TO DO NOW as a dialogue which would refuse to separate theory from practice, and practice from theory, for only in their unity "can all men's insistent talents and energy and skill be raised to a new level that sets an end once, and for all to his pro-history in class societies."

*For analysis of the voices of revolt in China see NEWS & LETTERS, Jan., 1972, special supplement on MAO TSE TUNG.
De-Stalinization — Ten Years After

East German and Vorkuta Revolts

June 17 to July 17, 1953, the month of never-before-heard-of revolts against Communist totalitarianism, first in East Germany, then in the forced labor camps of Russia itself, against Russian Communism to its foundations. All one has to do, to see that this is no exaggeration, is to look, on the one hand, at the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, and, on the other hand, at The Wall which the East German Government felt compelled to erect in 1961, eight years after the East German Revolt was crushed by Russian tanks.

Contrary to what both the East and the West have been saying, de-Stalinization began, not by Khrushchev in 1956, but by the East German workers in 1953, three and a half months after Stalin's death. It is they who put an end to the reign of the iniquity of Russian Communism. It is they who raised the daily standard of living, and the standard of civilization and education of millions of workers and peasants to come. In a word, the revolts against Stalin came, not from the top, but from below against the rule of the privileged millions of Stalin's empire, so grandly praised by that "collective leadership," after de-Stalinization, as before.

President Kennedy's current visit to the Berlin Wall, no more than Eisenhower's confidence to Stalin's heirs, can stop this forward movement against capitalism, state or private. It is for this reason that we must not forget what we wrote in 1956 during the Berlin purge. For, contrary to all the pinpricks at the time, we not only did not believe in Khrushchev, but pointed to Khrushchev as "a man to watch," and, above all, concentrated on the Russian workers: "All the pie in the sky, hydrogen bombs included," we wrote them, "will not thrust them back into their isolation that now the East German workers have revolted against these rulers and overnight filled the air with the stuff that makes dreams a reality."

September 1953 — The Berlin Purge

"Today the ruling bureaucracy is not the integrated whole it was in 1956. It is split all ways between Zhelvanov's men, Malenkov's men, and, and out of that picture, from Russia itself, many Russian "in present" Khrushchev men. Anyone who, like Nikita S. Khrushchev, the present Secretary of the Communist Party and himself steps into this post, is a man who must be watched."

"Even since the election of Trutzky, Stalin has had unlimited power. Even since 1956 he was so confident of his might and the容易 of the Russian masses that he could mobilize for his plans, although he had executed the entire military staff. Khrushchev used to rave and rant to Stalin, how easy it was to get the right to the full picture of Stalin's government had the perspective and suddenly got rid of the general staff as long as he was the leader of the world. He know where he stood for totalitarian economies has no room for a crisis; a crisis divided between political and military needs.

POWER WENT TO STALIN'S HEAD

"But by 1956, after two decades of undisputed power, topped by a military victory, Stalin, in a phrase of his own, said: "My way without success," I am not using it as a positive. According to workers' memories, a period of 12 months after the workers' revolt, there was no longer resistance to the loss of power. He needed only a crusade for war power, and Stalin, to grasp the new situation, he had been forced out of power over there, but had yet to face the real contender for world power — the United States. Zhelvanov was with him in not using the unused reservoir of workers for a breathing spell; he was ready to take the whole world on.

Khrushchev thought differently and, feeling that he could not win the argument about Stalin, had been evicted from power. For the first time since Stalin came to power, something had been done behind the back of the old master interrogator and murderer: no leader could reach undisputed leadership under such circumstances, on matters where leader roles have been fashioned around his name. The bureaucracy whom Stalin had and who they had failed to create in the so-called "iron curtain" contained the secret of victory and victory in the new situation created by the end of a world war was really won but which left each of the two state-capitalist giants so exhausted that a half had to be called...
The Freedom Now Movement

The first edition of American Civilisation on Trial came out in 1962. On May 2, the Birmingham Movement electrified the world. The second edition came out of the press on Aug. 28—the date of the March on Washington. In the months that followed, the Freedom Now Movement was put to the test. The dangers involved demanded that a new precept be added to the second edition of American Civilisation on Trial. The new precept is reported in full below, not in our editorial, but as our editorial.

This second edition of "American Civilisation on Trial" goes to press three months to the day after the first edition was put on sale. The popular demand for our companion is the fact that we alone have written in past history and in history in the making in one continuous development of the unredressed inequality of the Negro. This heightened interest in analysis is due also to the fact that in the short time between the Birmingham events on May and the March on Washington in August the manifestations of the resistance to the inequities of the status quo for the Freedom Now movement, the tremendous waves, eruptions, and release of the movement, which demonstrated the impotence of the null Congress with their house, were and must be totally new in the respective situation in the United States.

Thus, the movement compels the Kennedy Administration to admit a "rising tide of discontent" and an "arresting the introduction of a civil rights bill". In contrast to the original opposition to any March on Washington, on the alleged proposition, the Congress could not be ignored. Kennedy came to support the March. Unfortunately it's the kind of support a rape gives a rapist when thrown near them. Therein lies the danger to the Freedom Now movement.

This has brought the movement to the crossroads. Though it is important to stop the advance of the black struggle, the development of movement can be impeded if the underlying philosophy of total freedom is in any way compromised. Here, precisely, sees both the strength and weakness of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The transforming events of Birmingham have revealed King's new political awareness of both organizations. In his letter from a Birmingham jail to a group of "fellow clergymen," Dr. King rejected their attempt to confine the movement to Birmingham. "We cannot fight," he wrote, "that everything Hitler did in Germany was legal and everything the Hungarian Freedom Fighters did in Hungary was "right"..." This calls for a confrontation with the power structures. Dr. King writes: "As long as the "clerical" leaders of the black churches do not realize the augmented relationship of the 'I-thou' relationship to the 'I-they' relationship, they can only go on regimenting the black man. But King himself makes an impression, ethical rather than the living mass movement, the point of creative origin and forward momentum.

The Negro leadership is listening more to Kennedy's civil rights bill than to the mobilization of the movement. They fail to see that the alleged detente in the cold war and the internationalization of the Korean conflict will be damaged by the Administration's stand down against both labor and the Negro movement. This is why we say openly that, so far, the Negro freedom Now movement must stand down only to the extent of the immediate demands of desegregation, and not for the elimination of total freedom from race anxiety.

In this situation, a small organization like ours has a pivotal role to play both as a catalyst and a propellant. News and Letters Committee, which has participated in every phase of activity and struggle from the Montgomery Bus Boycott to the March on Washington, have an unique feature that distinguishes us from all other organizations. It is that we have, from the very start, refused to regress away from contact, as preacher from literacy. Take the need to change the role of white labor in the civil rights struggle.

While LABOR has so far shown a wary spectator, the labor leaders, like Kennedy, Reuther, McDonald and Hoffs, have all made statements and some have even marched with Negro demonstrations. The North, as in Detroit and San Francisco, but not in the South. When they have not publicly upgraded Negro workers nor acceded to their leading union posts countermanded with numbers and skill, nor have they done anything to enable the white rank-and-file...to participate in the Negro struggle as an integral part of their own common struggle against management.

NEGRO WORKERS from a Chevrolet local in Los Angeles, rigidly picketed the convention of the Urban League at which Kennedy was the featured speaker. They carried signs reading, "FREE NOW!" Another General Motors local picketed the UAW's Solidarity House demanding the upgrading of Negroes to union posts. In New York there's a plant that doesn't reveal the tension within labor.

Indeed, too, the Negro rank-and-file has shown its sensitivity by differentiating between the bureaucracy and the rank-and-file. Despite the appearances of numbers, mass, and despite individual situations of unemployment, as at construction sites in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, where Negro pickets fought white workers, the Negro rank-and-file has demonstrated the leadership and upset the white rank-and-file.

Newsletters, which has attacked the labor bureaucracy not only for its roll in the civil rights struggle, but also for its failure to fight management on Automation—The Negro and white rank-and-file to help forge the unity needed in the civil rights struggle. We wrote that the Negro could not realistically demand a change in direction nor a change in leadership. It was addressed to the labor leadership and said: Hear ye, ye, hear ye!—look at your lessons from that Sunday March in Detroit and all the battles for Civil Rights. South and North. First, you are selling your own interests because, without the unity of white and black workers, management can ride all over you, even as they did when you launched Operation Dixie and it proved to be just a short-lived. Know ye, far be it, that the end of discrimination, even more than charity, must begin at home, and home for working people is the Union, UNION THERE. Begin NOW to put an end to lily white departments. Begin NOW the retraining and upgrading of Negro workers who now, as before Kennedy, are still left to be hired and the first to be fired. Begin NOW to tell the white workers the truth of their own condition of unemployment and unemployment. For the truth is that, while percentage-wise, Negroes have more unemployment than white, it is still true, the white workers, the majority of Americans, who are still the majority in absolute numbers of those unemployed.

Beacon, you have begun contract negotiations a year in advance, with management. How about beginning to talk to us, your black brothers, 25 years after we helped to create the CIO.

The NEGRO LEADERSHIP, on the other hand, far from ensuring the role of the labor bureaucracy has actually protected it from the rank-and-file by playing up the lip-service and automatic shares with which the union leaders gave token support to the struggle. The greatest danger now is that the leadership of the Negro is at the bark and call of Kennedy—and especially in this situation where they yield to Kennedy on everything from unemployment to civil rights.

All the more reason to continue instead, with us, in the full tradition of the Anti-Establishment movement, in which was concentrated every strand of struggle for freedom—abolition of slavery, woman's suffrage, labor movement—and thus forever to new human dimensions. Look at Solomon Tiber whose creative activity emerged not only with the struggle but also with the woman's struggle. Look at the Marxists Joseph Weymouth, who was both a general in the Union Army and editor of a Marxist journal in the United States (which published Marx's English Emancipation of Labour) 15 years before it was published in Europe.

We alone, in Freedom Riders Speaks for Itself, not only participated fully in the activity, but in making it possible for the Freedom Riders to speak for themselves have been the only serious analysis, to date, of that great turning point and its continuity with what preceded and follows. In the News and Letters Committees we have not only supported, reported, and participated in all the great actions, but have compiled world attention to focus on them as central to the global struggle for a new society. The Freedom NOW movement must not be stopped in its tracks nor derailed. It must be expanded and deepened so that it leads to the total recreation of society on a new human basis.

We are not alone in this. No accident that this second edition of American Civilisation on Trial comes out when the movement is being bought to the last. The reader needs, now more than ever. This edition we invite you to face the challenge and join the News and Letters Committees...—National Editorial Board

* In addition to our list of publications it should be noted that Freedom Riders Speaks for Themselves is being translated into French; American Civilisation on Trial is being translated into Italian, and widely discussed among Japanese youth.
The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and the Sino-Soviet Conflict

By Sara Bunyan-bara, National Editorial Board

The cynicism and tragic irony surrounding the nuclear test ban treaty of the United States, Russia, and Great Britain put all too visibly the various statements aimed at getting approval from the U.S. Senate. Any one listening to Defense Secretary McNamara's stress on U.S. nuclear superiority over Russia, and/or Secretary of State Rusk's assurances that even Adenauer's Germany need have no fear of any challenge to its militarization, and/or Undersecretary of State ienniman's emphasis on United States' world leadership (that is to say, limitless military aid to prop up falling governments all over the globe), would think that these "New Frontliners" were asking approval for a state of war preparedness instead of a treaty whose "principal aim is supposed to be "the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament."

In order to get bipartisan support, No. 1 Frontliners eagerly give General Eisenhower, critics that himself, credit for having been the one who "first prepared" some such treaty. Thousands upon thousands of words about the U.S. war potential are being poured out to get a majority vote on a test ban treaty. (100 referrably brief - Sec.

THE, Aug. 21 It grates excess for the state of corruption of American society that this, precisely, is the emphasis required in the Senate approval at a time when the 1968 election is looming closer, and the Republican Party, already heavily influenced (if not fully taken over) by the New Left would rather play on the issues that Kennedy so well on Communism.

The Republicans cannot, however, oppose Kennedy's basic grounds because the people's opposition to nuclear war would not tolerate such an excuse to violate this weak, limited test ban treaty which puts restrictions only on the emission of the atmosphere, but in no way defines the preparations for war.

OPIStion TO War

The people's anti-war position is not limited to the United States, Russia, and Great Britain, "the originators" of the treaty. Nor is the opposition to war hampered by including the greater part of the world whose governments have lined up to condemn this treaty. So total is the opposition to nuclear war that, as two countries which dared openly oppose the treaty - North China and De Gaulle's France - had to claim that they did so "out of the roost of peace."

One went so far as to offer counter-proposals for nothing short of "complete, thorough, total and resolute prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons." That did not prevent him from attacking the actual treaty not only as "a big fraud" and "betrayal of the Soviet people," but also as an exposure of "the sinister features of those who warmly embrace imperialism. The exposure," he said, "of these freaks and monsters in their true colors is an excellent thing for the revolutionary struggle of the peoples and the
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Without Power (P powdered, Daily, Aug 2)

Because the outbreak of all the hostilities in the nuclear war is total Khronikines, this is in fact the only act of force that the US can undertake to reduce all its differences with Russia from the point of view of its "peaceful co-existences." As Moscow put it, "If the USA was not surprised that military transactions were in the interest of the USA, if it was not "smart enough" to understand the whole country's and Moscow's problems, it's because "the USA" intended to be surprised by the new nuclear war over missiles and warhead.

4) Despite his revolutionary role of the "struggle against imperialism," in the concrete, an expert in "peaceful co-exists," makes "nationalism," and even "war" and "national" and "national" and "national" are not the same thing.

5) The US foreign policy is still based on a "national" bourgeoisie, and even "war" and "national" and "national" are not the same thing. In this period, and even "war" and "national" and "national" are not the same thing. In this period, the US foreign policy is still based on a "national" bourgeoisie, and even "war" and "national" and "national" are not the same thing.

6) The US foreign policy is still based on a "national" bourgeoisie, and even "war" and "national" and "national" are not the same thing. In this period, the US foreign policy is still based on a "national" bourgeoisie, and even "war" and "national" and "national" are not the same thing.

7) The US foreign policy is still based on a "national" bourgeoisie, and even "war" and "national" and "national" are not the same thing. In this period, the US foreign policy is still based on a "national" bourgeoisie, and even "war" and "national" and "national" are not the same thing. In this period, the US foreign policy is still based on a "national" bourgeoisie, and even "war" and "national" and "national" are not the same thing.
can imperialism. Since Kennedy too wants to militarize this most industrialized country in Asia, and make it an integral part of "the West" at the same time, he will no doubt help create a "neutral" role for Japan at the UN.

KENNEDY AND KHRUSCHEV

As was abundantly clear from Kennedy's readiness to plunge the world into a nuclear war over Russian missiles in Cuba, nothing makes United States imperialism more ugly or, in a word, more threatening to "its" hemisphere. At his recent press conference Kennedy expanded himself on the question of China till the way into the "1970's" by which time it will have acquired nuclear know-how and created "potentially a more dangerous situation than any we faced since the end of the second World War."

Although for different reasons, Kennedy and Khrushchev do see eye to eye on the one question of the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries. The partial test ban was undertaken with this in mind. The treaty will force each to have more time to align his own orbit. This is one aspect of the treaty.

The other, more crucial, aspect is that Kennedy and Khrushchev need elbow room not only to isolate Man and De Gaulle respectively, but, above all, to bear down upon the class struggles and the civil rights struggles at home. The intensification of the class struggles and the national struggles will give the single advantage of reviving the old worlds that truly oppose each other not only tactically, or even strategically, but totally and from class foundations. The absolute contradiction is not between those of private capitalism and state-capitalism, with or without their multitudinous partners whether or not they dub themselves "Communists". The two opposing worlds are those of workers and capitalists in each country.

THE TWO WORLDS IN THE USA

Already Kennedy has begun his attempt to divert Negro demands for full equality into narrow legalistic channels, even as he has threatened to have compulsory "arbitration" legislation enacted in order to force the railroad workers to exploitize the management side of Automation. All the signs are that the AFL-CIO bureaucracy has just simplified the trade unions on the Automation front by refusing to back the March on Washington initiated by Negroes to fight for "Jobs and Freedom." Meany's fantastic excuse for the Executive Council's strike-breaking action—that AFL-CIO backing may keep some Congressmen from supporting the civil rights struggle—barely fools even the bureaucratists themselves.

The one thing that is clear is that the trade union bureaucracy has become an instrument in the war not only of the Negro Freedom Fighters, but of white labor's fight with management. All the more reason that, from below, white and Negro labor force a unity in those crucial times when a doctrine in the Cold War abroad means heating up the class war at home.

White labor has never faced a more crucial challenge to separate itself from the ideology of the ruling class. If they do not meet this challenge openly and positively, it will be the only of the counter-revolution that they'll next confront.
Sartre’s Search for a Method
To Undermine Marxism

By Raya Dunayevskaya, Author of Marxism and Freedom

It is a task of understanding the philosopher, so that the philosopher can understand himself. The philosopher is a kind of mirror, reflecting the reality of the world. The philosopher’s task is to understand the world through the mirror of his own consciousness. This understanding is not merely theoretical, it is also a practical one. The philosopher must be able to act, to change the world, to make it better. This is the ultimate goal of the philosopher’s work.

Because the Workers’ Councils were not an organized democracy, neatly packed for the modern Khrushchevian Leninist system of “uncompromising openness,” (p. 24) because the spontaneous, self-organization of the Councils had a life that was “purely local and inarticulate” (p. 24), the consequence of their forced suppression becomes the sufficient ground for Sartre’s preference of speaking about the Hungarian Revolution as “the tragedy” rather than the “endless creativity.” Sartre wants us, not to build a philosophy of freedom on that reality, on that “uncompromising singularity of the human inventor,” on that unmapped mass forcing the around, crystallized state might of the system; we must be supposed, instead, to follow Sartre in denouncing a full suit of administrative power to cover up Emontolov’s distorted view of reality, in all its nakedness.

We have already noted Sartre’s prohibitive remark on “Marxism.” (1) The myth of new tendencies—which express a Hungarian revolutionaries or Polish non-revolutionaries, by intellectuals or workers, by youth newly aspiring to “socialist humanism,” or old Communists like Imre Nagy upon whom freedom fighters suddenly thrust one hard—can be and is all of these living forces, the true human dimension, get head-shrunk into a non-differentiated category, “revisionism,” and shrugged off with a “despite their good intentions...” The fact that the apparatus was not theirs, but that of “Others” like the intellectuals, Khrushchev and Stal, who have long since transformed Marx’s theory of liberation into state-capitalist enslavement does not seem to disturb the philosopher of existence. Though those who fought for freedom from Russian Communist worldviews were the real “existents” in the Poland of 1955 when Sartre was

(Continued on page 7)
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Adding a second note, the philosopher of “the individual” didn’t take time and to summarize a single entry of that of that time and place for Leninism on the only truly original Communist philosophy that finally was swept up by the revolution in his native land—Georg Lukács—can be called “personalization.” (2) It is not by chance that Lukács-Lukács who so often visitates history—had found in 1955 the best definition of this frozen Marxism. (p. 25)

It has taken Sartre some 17 years to return to the field of philosophy. No matter what one thought of SWING AND NOTHINGNESS—and this writer can’t go on beyond (p. xxiv)

The central one of all Sartre’s criticism of “today’s Marxists” rests on the accusation that they have become “dramatists” who fail to see the problem of a given event, the facts, the concern experience, the now; in a word, reality, and have therefore caused the “temporary arrest of Marxism.” (p. 70)

But this was, according to Sartre, a period of “genuine and very period—there is nothing behind the Hungarian Revolution. If it was, the deep current event Sartre deals with, all the real of the book concerns Bagnalls, the most interesting is the dealt French Revolution: at the end of the 18th century, literature in general and Flaubert’s Don Camillo and the Hungarians of the period from the days of the Revolution to the time of the day. But it limits nowhere. It’s a rootless leaves a deep gap in the book, which is not due to the fact that we are still the same, the same the essence to the whole work. The shadow opens here Sartre’s Search for a Method, which is also the title of the essay in DÉ LA RAISON DIALECTIQUE, Vol. 1. Let’s follow the indications in the work we’re reviewing. Sade’s peremptory and unmediated dramatist Sartre, “joins that of the manual laborer, in whose bourgeois revolution gave meaning and which perceived at about 1794 that he was excluded from the unit—soul class.” (p. 167)

SARTRE’S DISTORTED VIEW OF THE PROLETARIAT

Now, Sade’s peremptory “joined” that of the manual laborer neither in theory, nor in practice. Theirs was a task of understanding the real, as seen in the situation, nowhere, in fact, except in the head of the Dictatorial Sartre, of his making the act, in the given situation, nowhere. Despite, in the head of the Communist Sartre, of his making the act, “join” that of the Sadean laborer, who by the very fact of being “excluded from the official class,” would gain that “equal for true universality” which would lead him, and to socialism, but to the one, thus to the other.

That Sade reveals it intellectually forces the utilization of the inconsistencies in that he is a true son of bourgeois society devoted to the dogmatism of the one, to the other, and the world of the masses who are supposed to be incapable of thinking on their own, and therefore must be managed to walk the binder and produce the more, by his takeover on the particular in the general, the concrete in the abstract.
incident"—as against the "abstract ideology of universality," the historic event against the a priorti judgment, "absolute cognition" as against dogmatism, Sartre may have destroyed as many dogmas as he claims. But one, insisted, yet underlying dogmatism continues to be the underlying motif of all Sartre's thinkings, views, does. Its the dogmatism of the boxers of the masses.

Sartre seems to revel in "revealing" that the Proletariat is not an "abstract ideology of universality," but a concrete separate entity: "Waves in Thermidor rendered possible by the growing discussion between the non-entities and controlling factors of the members of the Convention" (p. 150.) And then the shocking conclusion: "It is true that the people supported the Revolution and true, too, that their distress had counter-revolutionary tendencies." (p. 153.)

He sees "counter-revolutionary tendencies" everywhere—except, of course, in himself, and in the Communist Party, which even when it propounds actual counter-revolutionary acts, continue to remain "the only revolutionary Party." (2)

Failing to perceive alienation as manifestations of class contradictions, Sartre stands everything on its head and has alienations "give birth" to these contradictions. "In a socialist society, in a certain moment in its development, the worker is alienated from his production..." (p. 178). "...the new alienations which give birth to the constraints of socialist society and which reveal to us its abandonment; that is, the incommensurability of existence and practical Knowledge." (p. 179.)

Why is this matter of language so slippery, ambivalent, contradictory, confusing on the warp and woof of Hegelian and Marxist philosophy—the theory of alienation—where he should, as a philosopher of existence, get along so swimmingly? The Humanism of Marxism is grounded on this theory. Here Marx takes an essentially Hegelian dialectic, stands Hegel "right side up" and at the same time separated itself from what Marx called "quale vulgar and unthinkning communism" which was only the logical expression of private property and "completely negates the possibility of a return to the philosophy of freedom and of the Hegelian spirit." Since, to a philosopher, an "alienated existence" is an analytical phrase rather than an explorable reality, it becomes easy for him to destroy another idea, such as the notion of "freedom," therefore means the achievement of a "productive transcendence" rather than the giving up of the task for the today, Thore, Sartre writes glibly: "For the man in China the times are more than the present." (p. 97.)

A NEW COMMUNIST METAPHYSIC

No doubt, for the author of Being and Nothingness who rootless humanism in the "reality of the human man" (98) Moreover, this need is tied by Sartre to a "theory of errantry, (3) Sartre had insisted, from the beginning, that Marx's concept of freedom could not be realized "so long as the transformation of social relations and technical progress have not freed man from the yoke of necessity," (3) and agreeing with this, of course; Sartre has made a fetishism of the "short of the means of production, (3) The "clarifying of Marx's concept of the alienation of the human being itself must be viewed as mechanical manipulation is inescapable," writes Sartre, "the destruction of the progressive and the progress of the productive and progressive planning." (p. 97.) Just as Smith and Ricardo, despite their discovery of capitalism, did not correct the errors of the feudalists and the capitalists who preceded them.

"We are sure that, for every consideration, we have to have not good philosophers, but good organizers of a movement..." (p. 98.)

Footnotes

1. Due appreciation for the title by the best of Sartre's for no less a personality she, the chief philosopher for Polish, Communist, Sartre's name is in the list of notables, and hence here, and there, she is the title of "The of the Great Uprising," in the work of the great organizers. (p. 98.)

2. The following was prepared by the author of this article and the greatest platitude, "The of the Great Uprising," of the great organizers of the world's revolution..." (p. 98.)

3. Due to the great zeal of the author of this article, "The of the Great Uprising," of the great organizers of the world's revolution..." (p. 98.)

4. Thanks to the great zeal of the author of this article, "The of the Great Uprising," of the great organizers of the world's revolution..." (p. 98.)

5. "The of the Great Uprising," of the great organizers of the world's revolution..." (p. 98.)

6. Due to the great zeal of the author of this article, "The of the Great Uprising," of the great organizers of the world's revolution..." (p. 98.)

7. Due to the great zeal of the author of this article, "The of the Great Uprising," of the great organizers of the world's revolution..." (p. 98.)

8. Due to the great zeal of the author of this article, "The of the Great Uprising," of the great organizers of the world's revolution..." (p. 98.)


10. Due to the great zeal of the author of this article, "The of the Great Uprising," of the great organizers of the world's revolution..." (p. 98.)

11. Due to the great zeal of the author of this article, "The of the Great Uprising," of the great organizers of the world's revolution..." (p. 98.)


The Standstill of Nehru's India

A recent study by Somnath Deb of University of Hyderabad has illuminated the shocking state of education, or rather lack of it. In the average Indian village today, 35 years of independence have passed. The best survey was limited to 10, a village studied a typical rural school district of India's 40 million people still live in rural areas. This village, furthermore, is only 16 miles from Hyderabad, the fourth largest city of India. Yet in the village of 1,049 there was not one privately owned radio, nor a single regular newspaper reader, nor a village library. Fully 90 per cent of those interviewed gave as "source of information" Hyderabad's Press, and 56 per cent of these said their information came from "gossip." 

Although the villagers knew Gandhi had broadened independency ideas, and their countrymen had won independence, their knowledge of the world was scanty. As the study put it: "The common belief that the name of Gandhi is an unknown word and, far from meaning independence, is a curse to the people of this country, has been proved to be a myth by the present administration." 

As against the myth of Gandhi and Nehru as household words, the average villager did know of Communist China's invasion of India last fall, but one village referred to this invasion by Communist China as follows: "Some kings are fighting against us." It is all too easy to laugh ungenerously of this and dismiss the remark as sheer ignorance. We would come closer to the truth, however, if we coupled this remark with another village's identification of Nehru as "some Indian" and were thereby compelled to take a second look at Nehru's India.

INDIA'S INDEPENDENCE

India was the first country to gain its independence from British imperialism and thus, in 1947, open a new world that was to stretch from Asia to the Middle East, and from Africa to Latin America. Since all newly independent countries born in the next decade, 20 years, and all emerged out of colonial relations striving to free themselves from Western imperialism, the unifying link predominated over the division within this post-war world and seemed indeed capable of forging a new path for all mankind. 

India continued to be the land of villages, with a small educated upper class and an illiterate mass. A poor farmer, a merchant, a soldier, a judge, a doctor or a lawyer was all educated by a foreign system that has remained unchanged through the millennia. Each in the 19th century was educated in its particular small world. This is true of the whole country, basically a monolithic society.

India is a land of village, minguato, with an undeveloped agriculture, overbom with an entrenched landlord class, hardly industrialized, that was stratified on top of the semi-feudal relations. It was further built over by the British colonial system that has remained unchangeable through the millennia. Each in the 19th century was educated in its particular small world. This is true of the whole country, basically a monolithic society.

India was the first country to gain its independence from British imperialism and thus, in 1947, open a new world that was to stretch from Asia to the Middle East, and from Africa to Latin America. Since all newly independent countries born in the next decade, 20 years, and all emerged out of colonial relations striving to free themselves from Western imperialism, the unifying link predominated over the division within this post-war world and seemed indeed capable of forging a new path for all mankind. 

India continued to be the land of villages, with an outmoded agriculture, overbom with an entrenched landlord class, hardly industrialized, that was stratified on top of the semi-feudal relations. It was further built over by the British colonial system that has remained unchangeable through the millennia. Each in the 19th century was educated in its particular small world. This is true of the whole country, basically a monolithic society.

One element that would have created at least the semblance of an ideology in opposition to that expected in Ceylon is now itself in question since the Anglo-American aid will not only come with political conditions that might create its own image internally by relaxing the Indian Army to a new status. Since Nehru's government has not been backed by a protectionist class position it will inevitably go back to the Anglo-American axis and Indian Army ambitions.

INDIAN MASSES ARE NEUTRAL

In 1947, it is true that he is still holding on to one hope of not completely falling into the orbit of Western imperialism by creating a Russian sphere of influence which, in turn, is a Russian satellite. But Stalin seems to have been attacked by his Communist ally, and the Indian people have been left to their own devices. The Indian masses have not been influenced by Nehru's ideas, and many of them have not heard of him at all. 

TWO OPPOSING IDEOLOGIES

Statement of all kinds is the one that comes to Nehru's vision. Now that his "morality" principle lies as shattered as Bandura's "Dictatorship of Co-Existence," co-authored by J. P. Linville and G. G. Linville, he has suddenly discovered that Mao wishes "to destroy the Indian way of life." His calls that phrase off his moral lips as if it were some classless phenomenon instead of an expressed contradiction a chain over thousands of years of freedom that the Indians and those who knew the caste system gave Mao the illusion he could have as easy a victory within India as the military victory on his borders. The fact that the invasion, instead, united India as a nation should give us an indication that the same force that will forever be satisfied with a sham freedom to hold.

The truth is that Nehru was the chamelion but the same-
ness of the class—that of State Planners—which united Mao and Nehru at Randlang. This respect for the "Reference Price of Labor" and "Non-interference in internal affairs" means no foreign interference in class relations within each country so long as the third world could be a single unit against "the West." Mao still thinks that, even today, he can get appeasements to his grab of Indian territory by many of "the uncommitted nations," as indeed he seems to be doing at the Colombo conference meeting presently in Ceylon.

But if his Imperialist ambitions are all too clear, do Nehru's lesser ambitions constitute a different class phenomenon? The moment of independence was the moment also of the Truce signed with Pakistan. That unresolved conflict was another element in the temptation of Mao to attack.

There is no doubt that British Imperialism's maneuvers and their eternal attempt to break up a country at the moment of independence so as to continue its rule over it helped set up the division between India and Pakistan. It is as true, however, that once the countries did separate each had its own right to its own existence. Gandhi became a martyr when he fought to end the "knoy war" and build up fraternal relations. Nehru chose Memon as his "bully" man to prepare Pakistan's "Enquiry No. 1" for all of those 14 years, keep 300,000 of the Army at the Kashmir-
Indian way of life will create a new world apart from both
poles of world capital—the Russo-Soviet or Anglo-American
orbits—fighting for world domination. To cling to the discredited
"Indian way of life" is only one more way of saying "the old
cannot be changed"—and by losing the struggle for the minds
of men, losing both India and the new Third world.

* * *

FOOTNOTES
(1) Quoted in The New York Times (Oct. 27, 1923) summation
of this survey.
(2) Gandhiarm means both much more and much less, than
passive non-violent mass resistance. From Gandhi's first introduc-
tions of satyagraha and the resulting British massacre at
Amritsar in 1919, which connected in world affairs with the
Russian Revolution and the attempts in India to start a Morastu
movement which he fought, to Gandhi's role in the post-World
War II movement which he led to victory and then became the
proponent of the new nationalism revolutionary in Africa—
there lies a quarter of a century in need of analysis. Is this not
the place to attempt it.
(3) Barbara Ward, "The Rich Nations, the Poor Nations."
(4) See Takasi Oka, "The Paradigm of the Nineties," The
Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 25, 1963. One role for which
Gandhi will go into history is hardly ever mentioned, and yet it
will endure him more in future generations than the role he is
famous for. This "hidden" role is his recognition that "the
Party" in power is corruptible. Though he passed on his mantle
of leadership to Nehru, he himself refused to take a position in
power, and urged that others too must stay out of power and look
at the ruling Congress Party, their own, with "outside" eyes.
The Tragic Assassination of President Kennedy and the Urgency for Freedom Now

By RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA, Chairman
National Editorial Board

The fiendish assassination of President John F. Kennedy, on November 22, took place in the state of Texas, whose oil millions have supported every reactionary clique from the old China Lobby to the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy and the present founder of the John Birch Society, Robert Welch. The murder was committed in the city of Dallas, which welcomed the infamous Mine. Nbo, but spat upon the U.S. Ambassadord to the U.S. Adlai Stevenson. The fist deed took place in the southern region of the United States, which has remained true to one and only one, tradition, that of the slavery.

Not that President Kennedy had become a martyr to the very cause for which President Lincoln had achieved more than 100 years ago, a nation in mourning and grief.新中国 Kennedy had decreed that the 150th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation be observed in its celebration. The behavior of South and North, however, showed what it celebrated when it unleashed savage hooded dogs, backs up by high pressure hoses, and the life of racial riots against black children, because of their burning constitutional rights. These lynchings and murders were done in the mass in the name of William Moore, Malcolm X, the four Negro children who were killed by a bomb while at prayer in a Sunday school, not to mention the hundreds who have filled and are still filling the jails of the South. In Texas, resistance against the President extended from the fascist front to the combat of foreign affairs which might in any case have been tentative.

Before John Fitzgerald Kennedy arrived in Dallas, Texas, Birthers distributed leaflets which warned him of “assassination.” The hate-mongers had prepared the ground for assassinating the taking of the White House by President Kennedy. They had warned him of “assassination.” The hate-mongers had prepared the ground for assassinating him.

The CRUSADER YEARS OF THE FAR RIGHT

The minute, however, that circumstantial evidence began to pile up against the alleged assassins, Lee H. Oswald, as one who was connected somehow with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, that minute, suddenly, the crusaders took from the Far Right for President Kennedy began to flow. Major General, Edwin Walker, who had lost his way before, given the American flag upside down as a distress sign, because the city of Dallas had appointed to Adlai Stevenson, and who, the mayor, had announced that he would lead a demonstration against Kennedy, now spoke of his “glory.” He then boasted a thank you from Germany to his fascist friends there that he was “not surprised at the assassination which stunned the nation.”

The only other person to whom this shockingly incredible act was not a surprise was that creator of the myth of the “treason” of John Birch, Robert Welch. This creator of the delirious allegation that President Eisenhower was a “Communist” still not let his “glory” stop him from changing that the assassination was the result of a “scuttling Communists” policy.

Such other masses of hatred toward the very person of Kennedy as Governor Barnett of Mississippi and Wallace of Alabama rushed to Washington for the slain President’s funeral. They seized the opportunity to conspire with their counterparts in Congress who are not really moved by this outpouring of the millions who thought the only filling memorial to President Kennedy would be the passage of the Civil Rights Bill. Soon the very Smith of Virginia, Chairman of the Rules Committee, who has had the bill bottled up, said he was prepared to move; any faster while there was an air of mystique, by which he did not mean the assassination of the President, but the call for brotherhood and passage of the bill.

 Crusader years were shed also by “respectable” conservatives like Senator Goldwater, who had done all humanly possible to keep the bill petted up, including rejection (Continued on Page 2)
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Dallas, the city of black gold and white hate

No sooner did the police force of Dallas, that city of "black gold" and "white hate," become aware of the murder of J. F. L. Hunt that a cool million dollars a day was being put on display, for the murder of the man whose life, in the opinion of many, amounted to nothing more than a symbol of the city's power and wealth. The police force was quick to act, and within hours the suspect, Lee Harvey Oswald, was in custody.

1) Lee Harvey Oswald was arrested at 2:50 p.m. on November 22, 1963, in the City of Dallas, Texas, on suspicion of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. Oswald was later found not guilty of the crime.

2) The assassination of President Kennedy was a tragedy that shockedit was no less for the fact that it occurred in Dallas, Texas, a city known for its wealth and power. The event was covered by the media from around the world, with reports being broadcast on radio and television.

3) The assassination of President Kennedy was a turning point in American history, and its impact was felt by people all over the world. The event triggered a wave of investigations, both domestic and international, to determine the cause of the murder.

4) The investigation into the assassination of President Kennedy was one of the largest in American history, and it involved agents from across the country.

5) The investigation into the assassination of President Kennedy was a complex and multifaceted affair, involving not only law enforcement agents but also military and intelligence agencies.

6) The investigation into the assassination of President Kennedy was shrouded in secrecy and controversy, with many unanswered questions remaining.

7) The investigation into the assassination of President Kennedy was a catalyst for change, both in terms of the way the government operated and in the way people thought about politics.

The Dallas Morning News, "Black Gold and White Hate" (Continued on page 12)
Western Intellectuals Help K. inc.

Rebury Lenin's Philosophic Legacy

1953 marked the tenth anniversary of Stalin's death. Many academic journals in the West at any rate, celebrated the event by taking stock of every aspect of life—of politics, the economy, and from the political to the philosophical—in Khrushchev's Russia, concentrating on the same since the de-Stalinization Congress in February, 1956.

Khrushchev too, summarized the year 1953 as a turning point in the Cold War. Very interesting the the January 1959, which resulted not merely in an abstract. Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, but also to a multi-million dollar sale of American wheat to Russia, which provided a stipend for education, his NLL program became an arena of his presidencies that he died the very evidence of the Cold War.

The program of Khrushchev's, announced with such fanfare at the de-Stalinization Congress, seemed to have become the very rite of passage of Russian Communism. If not of their Chinese counterpart. Here we are interested neither in the self-proclaimeddestalinization nor in the much-feared "peaceful coexistence," nor in the lesser known aspects, of that famous 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party—the dictum on philosophy.

DEATH AND RESURRECTION

It will be recalled that First Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan had, in his de-Stalinization speech, followed his attack on the leaders for having failed in public, "an accepted history of the party for two decades." (It) by declaring: "One should say something, if even only two words, with regard to our philosophies—more important even than historian and economist." The inattention of philosophers in the Soviet Union was also stressed in the "act of publicity," which had done its duty efficiently, with the laws and policies of the country, but in the suppression of the creative development of Marxism-Leninism." The 20th Congress then decided that "the act of publicity" had imposed "Lenin's Philosophy anima," and so declared "The Creative Development of Marxist-Leninism based on the fullest exploitation of Lenin's Philosophic Legacy.

The speech of the Stalinists, Khrushchev, decried de-Stalinization, as the Stalinist intellectuals were put in charge of "saving" Lenin's Philosophy, specially his Philosophical Notes, from the de-Stalinization of Stalinism. And so began the rise in the Khrushchev hierarchy of the Stalinist philosophic clique of Milik, Yevstaf'ev, Romashov, Kondratenko, Ivanyuk, and Alexeyev and others.

By 1957 they produced a "new" textbook on philosophy, and Western intellectuals wrote, "the" "dictionary" between philosophic productions under Stalin and under Khrushchev. Whether this new attention paid to Communist philosophers for the presence of the nation, or reflected the natural state of estrangement of philosophy on the other side of the Iron Curtain, or in the Stalinist orthodoxy, there was no output that was not received indeed. Moreover, this characterized not only the output of art and philosophy, but also of the output of art and culture books, (2)

Where, however, the Western intellectuals were "stultified" with respect to the "new" textbook on philosophy, the Russian Propaganda Chief Ivanyuk, in 1959, contended that the philosophers for not carrying out the dictum of either the 20th or 11th Congress. By October, 1951, when the 22nd Congress of the Russian Communist Party first "declared" that Stalin held Lenin's Philosophic Notes in "disfavor," the Stiin-Soviet Union, still thus eluded as a debate over Blanu, overawed by a "Bolshevik" order, which indicated that the announced order of that Congress for which the drums had been beat for many months previous—the "Bolshevik" order, hailed as a greatest new Comruss Manifesto in the tradition of Karl Marx, which was to replace the one adopted in Lenin's time should all Western countries follow.

THE WEST TO THE RESCUE

It is probably true that it was already known little myth that, with, and only with, the 1956 de-Stalinization Congress die Lenin's "philosophic legacy," specifically his Philosophic Notes, finally fell into its own. But, this, nevertheless, was an impossible fact for bourgeois intellectuals to accept. A degeneration of Russian philosophy as it does of regaining of Russian Communism.

The hardest thing for an Intellectual to comprehend is now fragmentation. Not only does he seem to feel that only workers are subject to fragmentation because they work in factories, but he is more likely not to "be alive" his specialization since it is alienly even to the infinite scope of knowledge. The only way of preserving it is that the narrowing of vision of the socialists is only in part due to specialization. Fundamentally it is rooted in the division of every aspect of life between mental and manual labor. Or, more precisely put, to meet the specific point at issue, it is rested in his inability to react.

THE "THEORETICAL" PRACTICE OF STALIN, KHRUSHCHEV,

and MARE

It is this which Stalin grasped at with all his might when he replaced the theory of "praxis," a word Stalin endowed with the allures and weaknesses with which Humpty Dumpty endowed the word "shuck" and the word of praxis with a new meaning, and the word "praxis" is one that is not longer "pernicious" to the party. In 1956, when Stalin came face to face with the great agricultural crisis and declared himself to be the philosopher, "praxist," he meant the substitution of an abstract philosophy to the reality of the state and "therefore" the dictum to "quicken the hopes as a whole.

In his talk the same year Stalin took his first step in revising the Marxist theory of exalted reproduction, transforming the description of capitalist economy into the presentation for "socialist coexistence," what Stalin achieved in the 1956's with forced collectivization and the state-planned industry he secured. In 1959, with another seal of resistance, this time the Marxist theory of value, which defined a break with the dialectic structure of CAPITAL... Even so the 1947 Stalin-Zhdanov order philosophers to "replace" the Hegelian law of objective contradiction with a "new dialectical law"—"criticism and self-criticism," as it presently reaching its ultimate in Mao's present "thought reform" campaigns, as it has not been witnessed by Khrushchev who allegedly wanted "to return to" but to the Lenin philosophic legacy. Because this is so, the Stalinist philosophers not only survived desalinization but rose in the Khrushchev hierarchy. Because, on the other hand, Mao accused him of skepticism against his opposition, the latter, to agree to the dialectic logic with his opposite, Marx, they fall to see the true ideological continuity in Stalin-Khrushchev-Then and a sort of battlefronts to Lenin's break with the own philosophic past further assures Western Intellectual incapacity to deal with philosophical writings in Russian, academia as a whole.

NEEDED ANALYSIS OF CLASS NATURE OF COMMUNISM

Take the standard: Dialectical Materialism, a Historical and Analytical Survey of Philosophy in the Soviet Union, by Semyon A. Weiler, S.U., which had been first issued in Italy in 1949, extensively revised in 1962 for its German edition, and then again extensively revised for its German, and first English and American translation in 1964, in order to take account of changes wrought by the de-Stalinization campaign.

Weiler follows the Communist break-up of dialectical philosophy into two separate and distinct materialist and historical materialist, and further he limits his field of inquiry to "dialectical materialism." Having achieved that, he says that the whole of materialist dialectical materialist is available from Marxist materialist philosophy, which, in fact, imposed upon the theory of value a break also with the dialectical structure of CAPITAL. Weiler has only succeeded in self-satisfying himself in dealing seriously with the 1947's even break from Hegelian dialectics. The result is that Weiler finally deals with Stalinize order to the philosophers to find a "new dialectical law"—"criticism and self-criticism," as it presently the objective law of contradiction as interpreted by Hegel and Marx, and to say nothing more illuminating than the fact that the 1947 and 1962 discussions of "criticism and self-criticism" of the Fifteenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (December 1962) which had proclaimed Stalin's victory over opposition.

Precisely, this, however, needs to be understood. Not as a mere "criticism" but as a qualitative transformation into a great Stalinie victory over a great opposition...
The president, it is said, is not the first to say that he is the law of the land. But there is a difference in how he enforces that law. When the president enforces the law, he is acting in a constitutional capacity. When the president breaks the law, he is acting in a personal capacity. And that is why the question of whether a president can break the law is so important.

In a world that is increasingly divided by political and ideological lines, the question of whether a president can break the law is not just an academic one. It is a question that affects the lives of millions of people around the world. And it is a question that will continue to be debated for years to come.

But for now, let us turn to this week's events and see what they mean for the future of our country.

In Washington, D.C., the Senate has begun to debate the impeachment of President Donald Trump. The charges against him are multiple, including obstruction of justice, abuse of power, and conspiracy. If convicted, he could face removal from office.

This is a serious matter, and it is one that should not be taken lightly. But at the same time, we must remember that the impeachment process is designed to be a slow and deliberate one, with the goal of ensuring that justice is served.

For now, we can only wait and see what happens next. But one thing is clear: the fate of our country hangs in the balance.
the transformation of philosophy into mere ideology, but the foundation for the centralised State Plan, the nationalised economy could, and did, create a state-capitalist ruling class.

Having been shown neither the class nature of Stalinism nor the self-imposed blindness caused by specialisation in the field of dialectics, Vetter finally brings us to the post-Galin era and the "united" dialectics chapter -- only to present the 1955 revision of the law of "the negation of negation" as a reconstruction of the valid point of Hegelian and Marxist philosophy. For the first time the continuous use of quantitative measurements: (a) in the Short History of the CPSU (12), Stalin left out the law of the negation of the negation as one of the basic laws of the Hegelian dialectic, in Questions of Philosophy No. 2, 1929 Karpushin mentions it. (Never mind that he attacks it and perverts Marx's analysis of it; the point is that he does mention it and Stalin didn't.) Also Karpushin mentions the fact that the Early Essays of Marx have been dropped from the Collected Works of Marx. (Again, never mind that he regrets this omission: only because he rights it out for attack and revision; obviously the point with our interpreted philosophers is to have everything in its proper chronological order.) Forgotten altogether is that the Karpushin attack on the Theses of Marx was not just revision of theory of past events, removed by 111 years, but preparation for next year's counter-revolutionary suppressions of the Hungarian Revolution. (2)

(TO BE CONTINUED IN FEBRUARY ISSUE)

FOOTNOTES


2. In the West, too, so-called Marxism has become institutionalised -- and not only by ideologues in Italy, West Germany, Switzerland, Holland, but now even "radicals" in France prefer working with their theologians than the exposure to more fundamental opposition to Marxism who believe in the philosophy rather than merely specialises in it for pop that an independent work does not get the attention and circulation it should. Thus, Guden A. Wettig's Dialectics Methodism, built mainly on secondary sources, becomes the "standard," while David Jervis's Soviet Marxism and Natural Science, 1915-1938, solidly based on primary sources and discrediting many of the myths in the former, is shelved aside as only for academicians. Unfortunately, we cannot use much of it in this review since it deals with a different period than that which is our concern, but we recommend it highly.

3. Here is what we wrote on this same Karpushin essay: "Nothing changed Marx's social vision: the vision of the future which Hegel called the Absolute and which Marx first called 'real Humanism' and later 'communism.' The road to both is by way of the negation of the negation' that is to say, the destruction of the existing system which had destroyed the previous system. That is what the Russian ruling class predicts, that is to say, that the revolution against it, (Marxism and Freedom, p. 61)

Jan 1967
Western Intellectuals Help K, Inc. Rebury Lenin's Philosophic Legacy Part II

In Part I of this article on the state of modernization of philosophy in the West, I mentioned the historical.destination to Lenin's break with his own philosophical past which has led to the Western intellectuals' inability to cope with the deliberate evaporation of Lenin's philosophical legacy by the Communist theoreticians. I shall now develop this point.

Even an objective study as David Jerzavsky's Soviet Marxism and Natural Science, 1917-1933, cannot escape the consequences of the failure to grapple with Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks, written at the time of the collapse of the Second International at the outbreak of the first World War, when Lenin felt compelled to return to the origins of Marxism in Hegelian philosophy.

Mr. Jerzavsky sensibly remarks that Lenin's comments on Hegel's Science of Legenst have been "inherently suggestive of a new turn in his thought" (p. 20). He profoundly expounds Stalin's transformation of Lenin's alleged "postwar" in the field of philosophy into pure Stalinist monstrosity. He demonstrates that Lenin's aim, even in his Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, was "not to join the philosoph.-

...and so on...
FOOTNOTES

(1) "Western Marxian Education, 1922-43" in Survey, Jan. 94, Mr. Lichtheim's remarks follow his reference to Robert Tucker's Philosophy and Myth in East Asia, in casting the blame for such sophomoric performances on "the peculiarly American manner," Mr. Lichtheim cynically disregards both Marxian Humanism in the United States and the fact that the "sort of intellectual counterpart to the late Mr. Du Bois" weekly sessions on the evils of communism to which Mr. Lichtheim refers covers also the Sidney Hobes, David Bell, Lewis S. Feuer as well as their European counterparts. Furthermore, there is little difference between the professional anti-Lêninsk and professional fellow-travellers à la carte when it comes to a confrontation with the philosophic legacy of Lenin in his Notebook.

(2) "Soviet Philosophy Through Western Eyes," in Survey, Jan. 94.

(3) Hegel, The Phenomenology of Mind, p. 130.

(4) See Chapter X dealing with Lenin and the dialectic; a note in action, in MARXISM AND FREEDOM as well as the new chapter "The Challenge of Mao Tse-Tung" in the paperback edition of MARXISM AND FREEDOM. Excerpts from it are reproduced on P. 7.
Marxism and Freedom

New Introduction to the Second Edition

Only that which is an object of freedom can be called an idea—the idea.

The first edition of MARXISM AND FREEDOM went to press in 1947. The Little Rock riots shocked headlines with the scientific phenomenon. In 1952, two different events were again held in union in men's consciousness. This time James Meredith's courageous entry into the University of Mississippi took the place of Walter Sisulu's spectacular legal assault into space. An age in which "a little thing," as school segregation, can hold in tow such scientific institutions as an arm in which men's consciousness is preoccupied, not with scientific conquest, but with human freedom.

This new edition appears when our life and times impel an agency to the task of working out a new relationship of philosophy to reality. Thought and deed cannot forever stand apart. Somewhere, sometime, they must meet. Throughout history the force that has produced great social revolutions has always generated great philosophical revolutions. It was true when Flann unborn expressed the motive power of the English Revolution of 1648 as: "The greatest he in England hath a life to live as the greatest he." It is true when, in 1937, James Baldwin spoke of "a glimpse of another world ... I speak of change not on the surface but in the depths—change in the change of common." 17th century English. Leveller: fighting for equality, or 20th century Negro fighting for freedom now, pull inextricably into the intellectual tendency to recast the condition to original thought on the very eve of social revolutions that demand philosophical reconstructions.

The two features which characterize great periods of upheaval are new, that a new subject is born to respond to the objective pull of history; by making freedom and justice the reality of the day. And, too, a new relationship between theory and practice is forged. This is true for the post-Liberalists in 17th century England, the same ethics in the French Revolution of 1789-1914, the runaway slaves impelling the United States to the Civil War of 1861-1865, the N. Peabody movement in the 1912-1917 Russian Revolution. This is true for the present—In the Hungarian revolution against total militarism, and, even more significantly, the upsurge in the Negro fighting for freedom now. All mean that a new relationship between theory and practice is forged. This does not mean that each of these historic epochs has given up a certain way of thought. The ideas of a new era are a creative, born after much travail only when called forth by a new wave in world awareness of freedom. It does mean that a viable philosophy must be capable of meeting the challenge of man's unique experience, of the new reality symbol of the lack of specific freedoms.

To this author it meant that, no matter what the reasons were that enabled the transformation of the Marxist theory of liberation into its opposite after the Russian Revolution failed to realize, that is to say, no history practiced this philosophy of freedom (see Chapters 12 and 13), a return to the original form of the Humanism of Marxism became imperative. Because Marx's Humanist Essays were not available in English at the time MARXISM AND FREEDOM came off the press in 1948, I included these writings as an Appendix. Since that time there have been several English translations of these Essays as well as many commentaries on them. It may be assumed that the subject has not been abandoned, that it will remain alive as long as a new world or truly new human beings has not been established.

Totalitarian Communism understands this so well. Their counter-revolutionary suppression of the Hungarian Revolution went hand-in-hand with the suppression of thought. The subsequent Khrushchevian denunciation of MarxistHumanism as "fascist" and the denunciation of "revisionism" as the "main danger" did not, however, deter the American ideologues and ideologues from taking over the term, "revisionism," and similarly using it against the opponents of the ruling bureaucracy. The ideas of the Hungarian Communists have not only been revived, but revitalized. Marxists, the very intellectuals who had lost their collective tongue during the period of McCarthyism, now found their individual tongues to attempt to regenerate Marx.

The debate around the Essays degenerated into a question of first-cause as if it were a collegiate debate held for scoring points. As I stated during the discussion in 1948: "The division over who was the first to translate Marx's 1844 Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts into English is a matter of controversy only if it has a substantive relationship to the spirit of those Essays and of our times. I was compelled to be the first to publish these Essays in 1948 because for the fifteen years previous I had tried, in vain, to convince other scholars, writers, and publishers of the existence of those Essays. When in the period between the East German Revolt and the Hungarian Revolution, the Russian Communists openly attacked those Essays (V. Fromm Foner, 1950), I once again began my round of publishers. This time the Essays were part of the book. I held that the Russian Communist attack on them was not academic, but a forerunning of revolutions to come. The following year the great Hungarian Revolution raised the Humanist flag clearly, because Marxist Humanism, to me, is the only genuine ground from which to oppose Communist totalitarianism. I felt the compulsion to show that Marxism is not something invented by me, but came directly from Marx, who fought what he called "bourgeois Communism," and that that Communism, as such, is not the goal of human development, the form of human society."
capitalism, saying that I had paid insufficient attention to the changed conditions in Russia since the ascent of Khrushchev to power. They pointed especially to "the abolition of the forced labor camps." Curiously enough, this criticism came in large measure from those who denied the very existence of the camps until Khrushchev declared them abolished. That the worst of the concentration camps have been eliminated does not mean that there are none. It only means that "corrective labor" has taken a different, a milder form. Neither United States "free enterprise" nor Russian "communism" has changed the fundamental Marxist theory of value and surplus value, or capitalism as an exploitative relationship of capital to labor. After the Russian admission, in 1962, that the law of value operates in Russia, there was no further point to continue the detailed analysis of their State Plan. My analysis of the Five Year Plans, therefore, stopped with World War II, and thereafter focused on the Russian assault on Marx's CAPITAL and his ECONOMIC PHILOSOPHIC MANUSCRIPTS (see Chapters III and XII). There is no reason to revise my analysis.

What is fundamentally new now are the developments in the Sino-Soviet orbit. My analysis of the rift was originally elaborated in 1961 as part of a new book I am writing on world ideologies and the technologically underdeveloped countries. Because "The Challenge of Man" has a special urgency for today, I brought it up to date when Japanese friends asked me to include it in the edition of MARXISM AND FREEDOM they are preparing for publication in Tokyo. It is included as Chapter XVII in this new American edition as well. Both editions are going to press as we approach the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the International Working Men's Association in London, in 1848.

Raya Dunskyakaya

November 1, 1963
Detroit, Michigan
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A Forgotten Page of American History

The Populist Movement

It is true that by the time of World War I the old Populist movement was a thing of the past. The greatest truth, the one that still lives in history, however, is that, under the impact of the depression and the great struggle of the years of the New Deal, the Populist movement was re-born. In American history, it is a story of struggle and achievement that has been largely forgotten.

A. M. Lee

March 1904
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U.S. Support of Brazil's Military Coup Aids Forces of Repression

The Johnson Administration's unseemly haste, 12 short hours after a military coup took place in Brazil, to recognize its "constitutional" government, heap praise upon its "moderators" and 7,000 oppositionists fitted the jails before two weeks were over, and immediately guarantee the flow of dollars to it, brings into stark relief the treachery of America's infamous dollar imperialism, rushing to prop up another American oligarchies that can support themselves only with the aid of the military.

In Brazil it was Governor Alcino de Barros of Sao Paulo, Governor Laureto de Oliveira, the Army Chief of Staff Marshal Humberto Brunete, and others who planned and executed the revolt. In the process, another myth with which the Johnson Administration persisted fell: that now these "moderate constitutional forces" would clean up corruption. In fact, one of the main instigators of this coup, Governor de Barros, openly ran on the platform, "I may steal, but I do not things done."

Among the "villains" of this coup was evidently assuming top position to President Go- lart, who, from being a Communist, in himself a big landowner and could easily retire to Uruguay with the great masses who helped him in Brazil against once again, as with the previous president, Quadros, left to bear the brunt of the repression: the military will now carry out against worker and student alike.

When the right-wing banks howl about "cleansing out the community," they are talking about 25 Labor Party deputies in Congress and 18 Senators out of 60. In the Senate, former President Kubitschek said, "There is no excuse for violence against property or personal liberty."

At least three Rio newspapers gave strong backing to Kubitschek's warning to the military to avoid excesses. They protested that civil liberties were being violated by the police and the Army.

Nevertheless, on April 11, Gen. Bravo, the mastermind of the revolt was "elected" as president, with 80,000 people taking over from the temporarily installed provisional president Mamed. One of the last official acts of Mamed was the cancellation of a Guatamalan loan reform decree.

Bravo will have power to set all government expenditures, may declare a state of siege without congressional approval, and will rule with an iron hand. He will act as the new Gestapo, the state's political police. He will have the power to detain political opponents, to close down newspapers, to ban books, to imprison critics. He will have the power to use the army to suppress any opposition. He will have the power to use the police to beat and jail any who oppose him. He will have the power to use the courts to punish any who oppose him. He will have the power to use the government to enrich himself and his friends.

The coup in Brazil is a warning to all those who support American imperialism. It is a warning to all those who support the policies of the Johnson Administration. It is a warning to all those who support the policies of the American government.

The coup in Brazil is a warning to all those who support American imperialism. It is a warning to all those who support the policies of the Johnson Administration. It is a warning to all those who support the policies of the American government.
Spain only to make it an American colony.

In 1958 the Cuban Revolution at first acted as a great inspiration for all of Latin America. As it turned from its original communist program to state control, and finally, as the 1962 missile crisis subsided, it became an example of what could happen. This hope of independence and revolution was dissipated.

Now, however, the present United States-supported military coup will help create more Communism—not only in Brazil but throughout Latin America. The Castrocury will be restored.

There seems to be no way out of the spiraling of their own oligarchies when backed by American imperialism.

The progress of the new policy of American imperialism—supporting all that is reactionary and backward in Latin America—can be seen again in the Panama crisis.

**PANAMA REVOLTS**

The recent disturbances in Panama are the latest result of years of U.S. officials, as true imperialists, treating the Panamanian people as second-class citizens in their own country. It has come to a head as the result of freedom movements here and the example of African independence. They are not seeking purely pay adjustments or the right to fly their own flag; they are demanding the right to rule their own country, freedom from domination from Washington.

Discussions between Panama and the United States will be resumed, but with guarantees from Washington that it feels any obligation to make concessions other than, perhaps, to increase the revenue collected by Panama.

**EXPORTING DEMOCRACY**

Despite the fact that two and a half billion dollars have been invested by the U.S. under the Alliance for Progress, democracy has not been exported nor social reform seriously undertaken.

Where land reform has been undertaken, it has been a case of "keeping" isolated wilderness and land to the landless, for free markets, without operating machinery, irrigation or roads, a situation which only transfers the slave from the fields to the wilderness. The big estates have not been broken up and continue to produce the coffee, rubber and bananas, sugar and cotton for the export market.

Most Latin American countries, Brazil included, still depend on either one crop or one mineral for their economic life. The profits are deposited in Swiss banks by the landowners.

**FUTURE CONFLICTS**

The next point of conflict could be Chile, where an election is to be held in September and the leading candidate for President is Senator Salvador Allende, candidate of the Popular Action Front. Allende could win the election if present trends continue in Chile and Washington does not intervene with a military coup beforehand.

In Peru, President Fernando la Torre is trying to introduce land reform under the pressure of thousands of peasants who are seizing their own land in the highlands. His Congress is reluctant to grant any reform and will not discuss the new Washington policy on their own terms or use force and violence against the peasants.

The pressure of the poverty strikes means stand on one side and the resistance of the landowners and the Church stand on the other side of the middle of the road approach. Unless reform comes soon, the peasants as well as the miners will certainly begin to take matters into their own hands.

There is no other way out of the spiraling of American imperialism, nor can it be expected to do anything kind of "Alliance for Progress." Kennedy tried to initiate.
Malcolm X and the "Old Radicals"

Malcolm X has always seen the existence of a new Negro movement in America as the essential fact which sets him apart from the "old radicals."

"Politically, we are two radical movements which have something in common," he said recently. "We are all against the same thing."

"We are all against the same thing."

"We are all against the same thing."

Malcolm X has always seen the existence of a new Negro movement in America as the essential fact which sets him apart from the "old radicals." He sees himself as a leader of a new Negro movement, not as a leader of the old Negro movement.

"We are all against the same thing."

"We are all against the same thing."

"We are all against the same thing."

VIOLENCE AND NON-VIOLENCE

One is tempted to conclude that the old radicals have taken

"about a million dollars from the American taxpayer in the last ten years, and that the money has been spent for the benefit of a few black leaders."

"about a million dollars from the American taxpayer in the last ten years, and that the money has been spent for the benefit of a few black leaders."

"about a million dollars from the American taxpayer in the last ten years, and that the money has been spent for the benefit of a few black leaders."

Contrary to both Lenin and Trotsky—especially Trotsky who saw the idea

"that the American taxpayer has spent a million dollars for the benefit of a few black leaders."

"that the American taxpayer has spent a million dollars for the benefit of a few black leaders."

"that the American taxpayer has spent a million dollars for the benefit of a few black leaders."

UNITY WITH WHITE LABOR FROM BELOW

Total blindness to this, just this, has produced the spectacle of today's Trotskyists, following after those who would, and do, organize the unions, whether that be Meade or Sharpe. They do not believe whether the labor movement is a political movement or whether it is a cultural movement. They do not believe whether the labor movement is a political movement or whether it is a cultural movement. They do not believe whether the labor movement is a political movement or whether it is a cultural movement.

The real significance of the break from Eliza

The real significance of the break from Eliza

The real significance of the break from Eliza

FOOTNOTES

(1) The text of Malcolm X's statement at the March 12th New York press conference is reproduced in The Black World, March 22, 1960, while a special statement is made in The Black World, April 18, 1960. All quotations from Malcolm X, above, are from these two sources.

(2) See our analysis in American Civilization on Total, especially p. 349. Essentially enough, the demand for a separate black nation is the expression of the desire for a black nation, not as a political movement, but as a cultural movement. The demand for a separate black nation is the expression of the desire for a black nation, not as a political movement, but as a cultural movement. The demand for a separate black nation is the expression of the desire for a black nation, not as a political movement, but as a cultural movement.

Guerrilla Tactics in Ideological Struggles: Study of Mao’s Thought

Every day brings a "new stage" in the Sino-Soviet conflict in line with Mao’s views on revolutionary war, but one of "permanent revolution" against "revisionism." The Maoist lesson is that even more than the application of guerrilla tactics to ideological struggles, those who wish to seize themselves trounces on the underlying national interests, and therefore mere "guerrilla warfare" transferred to the field of ideas may give the appearance of a "revolution" of world revolution," but it is the Stalins who call for liberation no more underlines the "Sino-Soviet" than does the question of world revolution that of imperialist war.

For more simplicity, the struggle for leadership within totalitarian Communism is a fight to be at the helm of each country, with the struggle for the control of the Soviet Union and China, but between the nuclear giants, Russia and the United States.

THE GREAT DEBATE ON THE GREAT WALL

Take the latest point in dispute. On May 23rd the Chinese Communist Party put out a statement, and reiterating the Soviet Communist Party proposal made on March 15th, for a world conference of Communist Parties to be hold this fall. The party view is that it would take 5 or 6 years "if we don't learn to prepare for such a conference.

If this rate continues to China’s steady increase in numbers and power, especially the immediate exclusion of Russia from the Berlin Exhibition and the corresponding activity in Asia, the Chinese Communist Party will not go to the conference. The latter is to be a "preliminary" to the "preliminary" to the "preliminary" to the "preliminary" to the "preliminary" to the "preliminary" to the "preliminary" conference of Communist Parties.

It is not just to China or to China’s "real" enemy, the "real" enemy of the Chinese people, the "real" enemy of the world, the "real" enemy of the world, the "real" enemy of the world, the "real" enemy of the world, the "real" enemy of the world.
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Far from being opposing that blocked power, class collaboration and struggle for state power complemented each other. This was true both when Mao did not yet achieve power but nevertheless saved China's life at the very moment when China's own army mutinied against him at Hsing, in December 1934, and when, in 1949, Mao drove the corrupt and disintegrated Kuomintang from mainland China.

As against the original Red Army, born in Russia in 1927 out of decolonization revolution, and vice versa, Mao's Red Army outflanked the cities and appealed to the "good" capitalists, "the good landlords, the honest" petty bourgeois intellectuals to remain part of "the people" and manage the Chinese economy.

Mao no doubt can prove to those who hunger for state power that they have no base in a mass movement, no developing peasant revolution and no emerging national liberation movement, that guerrilla war is "an assured" road to power. But it should be obvious that this road to state-capitalist power is not the road to a new, viable, revolutionary social order where destiny remains in the hands of the working people. Clashing the fight for political power in Marxist garb cannot and has not, hidden Mao's imperial ambitions, whether this takes the form of invasion of India, or ideological wars of Russian 'Thought.' All it can, and does do, is to show that "Mao's Thought" generates guerrilla tactics for its ideological battles precisely because power politics dominates it.

THOUGHT & LIBERATION

Maoism-Hunterian is not only the way to struggle against Communist totalitarianism. It is, above all, the path to actual freedom. No Iron Curtain, no Great Wall. Chinese or East German, can be erected to exclude Maoist-Hunterian, as was shown in the East German Revolt of 1953, the Hungarian revolution of 1956, the "Hundred Flowers and Hundred Schools of Thought" that bloomed and contended in China in 1957. Indeed, despite the present debates over "powerful co-existence with the West," what bothers both Mao and Khroushchev is the non-powerful co-existence of the ruling "intellectuals" (totalitarianism's euphemisms) name for oppression) on the working people in "the East." It is true that Mao has ever since 1966 taken the initiative in bringing the Sino-Soviet conflict into the open, and has accused Khroushchev of moving "from fear of nuclear war to the fear of revolution." It is also true that Khroushchev has hit back with "only a child and an idiot do not fear war." Nevertheless, Mao's simulated revolutionary thunder does not and at a new level indeed any more than does Khroushchev's policy of so-called powerful co-existence. Each is a totalitarian ruler in his own country. Each wants to be sole ruler over the state-capitalist world they both call Communist. It is not Western imperialism that will bring down these regimes, it is the working people in those countries. And it will be done with the same philosophy of freedom as that needed to gain liberation from Western imperialism. This way alone can thought be liberated from the stranglehold of guerrilla warfare.

May 1964
Sino-Indian War Reveals Relationship of Ideology to State-Capitalist Imperialism

(Edward's Note: Because the death of Nehru gives a new aspect to the question of the nature of the Indian crisis, we reprint the leading Russian Democratic writer at the time of the China-India war.)

The sudden, unexpected unity of the Indian people, born out of opposition to China's invasion of their borders, has no doubt been influenced and hastened by the fall of Nehru, at least temporarily. The fact that this fall has been welcomed with the official military plans to invade on two fronts, one for capturing and isolating support from "foreign aid," the other for keeping the "kamikaze" of China, on an uninhibited line of action, is of the significance of the new factor of Indian unity from below, indeed, and emerging strength in the attempted blockading by the Nehru-Moscow apologists for Mao's China, over the entire political scene.

In The Christian Science Monitor (11-27-27), Sherhab S. Sohansky writes, "Contradictions in the defense fund today and today, and how they continue uninterupted. On this front, it is interesting to note that India is in a position to back the outcaste, the dispossessed, and the underemployed who hate the quene of contradiction, given in many cases, all their means marriage to prove that freedom, even without bread, is a more precious heritage. (My emphasis).

The very life of freedom compels the drawing of a balance sheet of 15 years of Indian independence during which the Congress Party has proceeded in its guiding way, as China has proceeded with "freedom" without regard for the sensitivity of the masses which made independence from colonial rule possible, and is presently saving India from the collapse upon which China cannot.

I do not mean immediate and wider collapse—not even Mao could consider a shorter route to the same uncolonialism in absolute order. I mean the kind of chaos and confusion which would have made possible "very fruitful work," within India, for the original wing of the Indian Communist Party.

Instead, it brought about a national unity not seen except in the struggle for independence from British imperialism, and as popular a resolution against China as a world-wide resolution, "without bread," that not only Nehru speaks, but Nehru remains in power on no other condition than of being down (and eventually at that) on the Chinese side. In the long term, that may eventually explode into a direct front into the Anglo-American imperialist camp, into a total war with China, while, whatever victories or losses, a new China will again change nothing fundamentally for the world, while the fact that China is not that serious freedom but death will be the possession of the conquered Indian people.

Wherever in the American orbit, or the Chinese, or the "central" Indian orbit, and everywhere, the same happens to China. Why did independence from British rule not lead to a non-explorative society in India and China, as they are today, with the people of the world, instead of remaining in constant class and a "socialism" that China's "revolution" is a consequence of that and the consequences, ideologically and militarily. That has made it possible for Mao to take the position of the world and to read India's history and China's history, with not to mention the propaganda theme against India for "socialism" in the form of United States imperialism.

The obvious aspects of the Chinadetl war—be that China did the invading, and that India was compelled to go to the West for military aid even as the world is still trying to get some sense from Mao's campaign cannot change the objective fact that the entry of American Imperialism into the world means that Indian relations will be the same whether or not the war is resumed.

INDIA SINCE INDEPENDENCE

India was the first country to gain its independence from British imperialism and then, in 1961, opened a new third world that was to war itself to the Middle East, and from Asia to Latin America. Since all newly-independent countries born in the next 12 years, 1960's, all emerged one or another movements struggling for freedom from Western imperialism, the unification paradox is evident in the military presence into post-war world, and seemed indeed capable of forging a new path for all mankind. It was one of the richest in culture and the spirit of new political ideas to play a central role on the Asian continent. As the Asian continent itself as the China-Tibet border, or the anti-war movement of resistance method to gain freedom, India's world role about to be enhanced. It is indeed the only that no fundamental change in human relations followed independence. The dominant Congress Party 8, which had succeeded in isolating all elements against foreign domination, began demonstrating its true face nature by yielding, production relations, in the city or the country, brutally undermined.

India continued to be the land of villains, with an unbridled agriculture, overgrown with an entrenched landlord class, and a system, partial nationalisation that was geared to the "free" of the "socialist deals." It was further both overestimated, and underestimated by the Indian state system that has remained characterless.

(Continued on Page 7)

1. Gandhi means both much more, and much less, than the anti-war mass resistance. From Gandhi's first introduction of "non-cooperation" and the ensuing British measure of "massacre in India," which included in world affairs with the Russian Revolution and the attempts of India to start a Marxist movement which he founded, to Gandhi's role in the post-World War II movement his leadership led to victory and thus became the prototype of the new nationalist revolutionary in Asia—there lies a quarter of a century in need of analysis. This is not the place to attempt it.

2. One other role for which Gandhi will go down in history is hardly overestimated, and yet it will endure him more than ever greater than the role he is famous for. This "silent" role is his recognition that "The Party," in power is corruptible, though he passed on his mantle of leadership to Nehru, he himself refused to take a position of power, and urged that others too must stay out of power and look at the ruling Congress Party, their own "visible" eyes, through the window. Both in the 20th century, Nehru designated it as "the philosophy of unfreedom.

It is true that, politically, there was his independence from British rule is not "recognized"; he made his life, not in India or Britain, and a parliamentary democracy established abroad and in the country. However, it remains dominant so that when in the city, with their government's policy and others, within the sacred cows and unmoved disregard for human life, the results remain the most characteristic features of "freedom".

Every leader in the new third world seems to consider himself a "revolutionary." From Mauve to Nasser, from Mao to Khrushchev, not to mention the "Mainland-Latin-American-Hitler's-Nazi" Center, both, though the most of their human difference are concerned with, but the true role of the world and the money of the world, economic growth, the revolution, the meaning of the third world in the "realities." Even that the between the Indian way of life, and the middle way. This has given Indian private enterprise the best chance in the world, and the average cost of life is the same. But the same is life and the unemployed are millions. Even with the same mean, Indian investment is not the same as that of the Chinese rate of investment 30% as against 5% of national income).

TWO OPPOSING IDEOLOGIES

India's problem in India is not the one that covers Nehru's vision. Now that the "revolutionary" principle lies as shattered as the old one, the one that Mao has discovered is destroying the Indian way of life. The role that plays off the moral role as if it were some other revolution, the role of the state and the contradiction of the new role, the role of the Indian people.

The truth is that it was not the classlessness that was the solution, but the conclusion, at a step in the Third World, that Mao still thinks that, on that line, he can get anywhere with his "party" in the ruling body politic. But the illusion he could have on easy victory within India to the military victory on his borders. The real fact is that, instead, united India as a nation should give no illusions to Nehru like..."
There is no doubt that British imperialism's maneuvers and their eternal attempts to break up a country or in the moment of its independence or to continue its rule over it helped set up the division between India and Pakistan. It is as true, however, that even if the country was separate, each had a right to its own existence. Gandhi became a martyr when he fought to end the "silly" and build up fraternal relations. Nehru chose Moslem as his "only man" to proclaim Pakistan "Enemy No. 1" for all these 14 years, keep two-thirds of the Army at the Kashmir site while leaving the borders in China unprotected from that "silly."

Despite its "period of glory"—the 1947-8 Kashmir war—Nehru had not allowed the Army any decisive role in the Indian pattern of life. Despite the fact that he allowed the nithy-conservative nationalist-educated officer class to have the Army under its command and pay some old imperialist roles—in Korea and in the Congo—Nehru's concept of the role of the army made it subordinate to the civil authorities. In this he fundamentally differs from Moslem, even in the Communist trend: state-capitalist orbit holds to a special militaristic position. The Chinese Constitution is in the only one where not only the "Party" but the Army is made responsible with the state authority.

This one element that would have created at least the semblance of an ideology in opposition to that expended in China is in new itself a question since the Anglo-American aid will not only come with political strings attached but inevitably create its own image: internally by raising the Indian Army to a new status. Since Nehru's good anti-military instinct was not backed up by a proletarian class position, the Indian Army is made in the Anglo-American advice and Indian Army ambitions.

It is true that he is still holding out one hope of not completely falling into the orbit of Western imperialism by counting on Russian aid, but inside as the Indian masses are concerned does it really matter whether it is the Russian or the American nuclear orbit? Even as a foreign policy, a military line is a conservative, rather than determined, of the class relations within the country. IN THIS LIES THE DANGER THAT INDIA MAY STILL CAPITULATE EITHER TO COMMUNIST TOTALITARIANISM OR TO A MILITARY CLICHE.

Nehru's unique authority in India does not stem from his creation of new relations with the great mass of the Indian people who must bend both to his State Plans and to the private capitalist and entrapment landlord interests. He has been a leader of the struggle for independence from Britain; and he has now been attacked by his Communist ally, and the Indian people have saved him from downfall. His desperate attempts first to seek for a new ideological banner and come up with "the Indian way of life" will create no new world apart from both poles of world capital—the Russian-Soviet or Anglo-American orbit—fighting for world domination. To cling to the class-ridden "Indian way of life" is only one more way of saying "the old cannot be changed" and, by losing the struggle for the minds of men, losing both India and the new third world.

It was no accident that in the 15 years since independence, in the 15-year alliance with Mao's China, in the 7 years of "Afro-Asian Solidarity Conferences", plus the Inammarble "neutralist" conferences since, Nehru failed to condemn Russia either for its counter-revolutionary role in pushing down the Hungarian Founds in 1956 or for its unilateral breaking of the nuclear monomaniac quasistasis in China's conquest of Tibet and bowed sufficiently to the

U.A.R.'s stand on Israel not to open an embassy there, although he had been among the first to hail its independence. The opportunism, the short-sighted, the selfish-nationalism, the affluent in foreign and military politics, was the counterpart to the so-called socialist, but actually capitalist, exploitative relations internally. The Indian people who have pushed him off his "neutralism" for the Sino-Soviet orbit, must now see that he doesn't merely shift over to the Anglo-American orbit, leaving production relations and ideological base as unchanged as the changeless caste system of "unfreedom."

Go Barbaro Ward, "The Rich Nations, the Poor Nations."

June-July 1964

6732
Introduction to New Japanese Edition of Marxism and Freedom

Spring into freedom by the postwar youth of Japan presents a challenge to an author who would write for such an audience. This author frankly admits that the great pleasure at this opportunity is not wrestled with tragedy, as it is in a society where the lack of meaningfulness may lead to development of that even if it seems to be only a form of regression, it is with the realization of Japan's industrialization and ‘modernization’ in the last quarter of the 20th year, that the Marxist Revolution, the last generation has made its break with the past so that it has, literally, leaped over centuries.

JAPANESE ‘NEW LEFT’ SEeks PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS

Under the impact of the postwar labor struggles, the first period of Marxian movement in Japan, the ‘Left’ was born in 1948. It found itself challenging both capitalism and communism. By the mid-1960s, the mass revolts led by the Zengakuren had inspired the growth of a New Left of student activists. In contrast to the European New Left which, despite its revolution against Russia's crush- ing of the Hungarian revolution of 1956, had by now either found its way back to the Communist fold, or joined the pole of ‘Western’ capitalism, Japan's New Left is pursuing its political differences to their philosophical foundations. Thus, in its strength, and thereby, it has a basis that extends far beyond its national frontiers. It has established this writer to turn to this audience with a special edition of MARXISM AND FREEDOM which, from its publication in 1930, has as its aim the re-establishing of Marxism philosophy in its original form, designated by Marx himself as a ‘throughout naturalism or humanism.’

From the beginning of my break with Leon Trotsky over the ‘Russian Questions’—during the Hilltop-Balto Post which gave the green light to the start of the Second World War—I became interested in the economic development of Japan. The reader will find brief references to this in Chapter XII (‘Japanese State Capitalism vs. Workers' Revolts’) where I show that neither the rate of economic growth nor the ‘planning’ in and of themselves are synonymous with the existence of a workers’ state. On the whole, however, MARXISM AND FREEDOM is devoted to the freedom struggles of our age of Automation and the ‘human’—deals mainly with the United States and Russia. The book is not natural, therefore, that the Japanese Marxist-Imperialists would accept it as a whole, and this was to be a new appendix for the Japanese edition.

NON-VIABILITY OF STATE-CAPITALISM PROVED IN LIFE

In the 1930s, Japanese Marxism, as with the rest of the Second International Marxists, was beginning for the first time on the question of the state. By 1933 the ‘Internationalist’ in Marxist terminology can no longer cover up the power politics in the turbulent conflict. Thereby the non-viability of state-capitalism as any ‘socialist’ society has become clear. ‘Marxism’ can act as a retarding factor only to one who has to be included in the struggle. In these power politics, the time of ideas, such as an intellectual escape that he has learned the Marxist-method politics in the West. Hence, the materialist and the radicalism that can be a new appendix for the human dimension.

It is this dialectic difference within the Japanese New Left that has broken the ground. The question of the class character for this weakness, the human, universal, non-historic. Neither will it force the international cooperation of the working class itself to the realization of the human dimension, the humanization of what is human, the realization of humanism. Nevertheless, the Vatican has been pleased to disapprove of it! May we not express our sympathy because the Nazi had the privilege of waging total war with a total cruelty the Holy War was not equally dignified?

The Italian Communist party, Il Tricolore on August 10, 1945:

"The news that an atomic bomb was dropped by the American Air Force has made an enormous impact throughout the whole world and has been received on all sides with a sense of pain and shock. The news is so serious that we are going to lose our lives. The death of a human being... We do not share the same joy of terror which has been expressed in some previous comments because we are not in a condition to discuss the question which was made for the first time by the German scientists."

On August 14, 1945, the day before Japan surrendered unconditionally:

"There was no official hint of the length of delay that the Japanese are to be allowed before the full force of Allied power— including the atom bomb—is faced against them in a blow final to be felt."

In providing as empty a shelter for man, as the fall-out shelter for the body, Communist state-capitalism is giving full proof of the iniquitous Marx had long ago predicted for the imperialist system. This has never been truer than since World War II ended with the decay of this imperialist system. The nuclear hour is no longer the hour for the human hour is the hour for the total hour, and the atom bomb is the hour for the human hour.

The fact that the proletariat is unarmed has never stood in its way as it opened new stages of freedom in humanity's development. Surely the nuclear theme has the power to destroy civilization as we have known it. But the nuclear age is also the age for the struggle of men's minds. To stay the nuclear hour by winning the minds of men—this is the road to his survival and to freedom."

"THE HIGHEST BEING FOR MAN IS MAN HIMSELF:"

To rise to the challenge of the times requires another new banner. Marx was the first to see this in all its breadth and depth —as both a birthright of history and the realization of philosophy. Because he had put the human being in the center of all his thought, he could unite theory and practice, modern materialism and materialism, and, unlearn, throw the tangle down to the armed bourgeoisie. When asked by his closest intellectual friends had broken with his class and became a ‘rational’ and scientific worker. The substantial means to grasp something at its root. And the highest being for man man himself."

The urgency that our epoch of necessity imparts to the humanism of Marxism has brought Marx's struggles with vulgar materialism and vulgar communism as well as with private capitalism and reactionary idealism out of history and of theory and into the quintessential practices of the day. Lenin did not know the Humanist Essays of Marx—they had remained in the vaults of the Second International for a time. But the time had been ripe for the humanism to return to the philosophy of Marxism. The three pillars of Marxism were found in the Russian Revolution and in the humanism that Henry Beveridge delivered to the world. The shock of betrayal made it manifestly impossible any longer to consider matters on a political plane alone. His break, indeed, was not only with those who betrayed, but with his own philosophical past. His humanism deleted the conditions for future revolutions, and conquered everything he was to write from then on up to the day of death, that is, from imperialism and state and revolution he is his last speech to the Russian Communist Party's 8th Congress and his will. Unfortunately, this remained a dead letter in the Marxist world. Not only was this true of those who, like Stalin, symbolized the transformation of the working class' state into the form of the human being: those who, like Trotsky, lost his life fighting the Stalinist bureaucracy.

So far has been the void in the Marxist movement since the death of Lenin that one would think that Lenin's admonitions and the administrative mentality of bureaucracy, as well as Sakharov's failure to "fully understand the dialectic" were the words of an asceticism in an ivory tower. In the end, of a great revolutionist on his destiny, warning about the downfall of the final worker's state and the "return to the age of the Stalin" unless one began not only with the removal of the "rude and dialectic" Stalin but also with the philosophy of the concept of recognition of the Marxist dialectic. Lenin himself had Lenin note: "Practice in the theory of cognition. Alas! Marx's cognition not only reflects the objective world, but creates the world."
A TOTAL PHILOSOPHY AND A NEW THIRD WORLD

This is the task that confronts our age: how can the movement from theory meet the challenge of the movement from practice which strives to reconstruct society on totally new, truly human foundations. The challenge is not to machines, but to men. The compulsion for a unity of theory and practice arises both from the impulse toward a new society and a socialist philosophy. It has now enveloped the whole globe. In Europe we have witnessed new tragic decades—from the 1937 Spanish Revolution which sought to realize the politics with economies by at once taking over the factories, through the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, where Workers' Councils, Councils of Intellectuals, Councils of Revolutionary Youth, all sought to unite politics, economics and philosophy under a new banner of Humanism which the Communist totalitarian states had called "Revolutionism."

This search for a total philosophy has discovered a new, a third world in the post-war revolutions in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. It is this new, third Afro-Asian-Latin American world, which is at the root both of the struggle for world domination between Russia and the United States as well as within the Afro-Asian-Latin American world. And it is this world which opens the greatest challenge to the intellectuality as well as the proletarian of the most industrialized, industrialized land of this third world—Asia. A country which could, from the ruins of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, have such an astonishing industrial development that its rate of growth now challenges both Russia and the United States, and at the same time, give birth to a generation that has totally broken with its past, is a country that is sure to produce the future theoreti-cons of genuine Marxism—Marxist-Humanism.

For what cannot be separated from this break was that it was not only a break with Japan's capitalist and militaristic past, but a refusal to submit to any established authority, whether that of the American imperialist occupying power, or established Marxism, that is to say, the existing state-capitalist societies passing themselves off as "socialists." Hence the split in the Zengakuren. The great demonstrations in 1960 proved all this beyond the pale of any doubt. A theoretical development to match the practical activity of youth and labor and women, all striving for a new society, is on the order of the day.

Revolutionaries do not rise in the fullness of time for the purpose of establishing a party machine, but the party-machine is the new society, and the voluntary, spontaneous rebellion of the millions. Marxism is a theory of liberation. It is a theory of liberation, and it is nothing. In thought and in life. It lays the basis for erecting a new human foundation, with which our new society has visibility. This author feels confident that the Japanese workers and revolutionary intellectuals have an important role to play in the creative drama of human liberation.
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All Roads Still Lead to Berlin
Mao’s Bomb and Khrushchev’s Fall

BY RAYA DONAYEVSKAYA

Author of "History and Persuasion"

In the short space of 18 hours the world scene has changed so dramatically that it’s very nearly beyond comprehension. Or is it? China has exploded its first atomic bomb, and, like all other destructive achievements in recent world history, it has been faced with immediate challenges, both from the superpowers and from the masses. The United Nations voted to condemn China’s actions, but the atomic bomb has already achieved more in the battle for world peace than any other weapon in history. China’s entry into the atomic age has been welcomed by people all over the world as a step towards ending the nuclear arms race.

The great power of China’s bomb has already been felt in the Middle East, where the tension between Israel and its Arab neighbors has been increased by the knowledge that China has the means to counteract any nuclear threat.

In the wake of the Chinese test, the United States has announced that it will expand its nuclear arsenal, but this only serves to increase the risk of an arms race.

The Chinese test has also been seen as a challenge to the West, and the United States has responded with a threat of force, if necessary.

The Chinese test has also led to a renewed interest in the Sino-Soviet conflict, as the two countries continue to compete for influence in the region.

The Sino-Soviet conflict is a complex issue, and it is not clear what the outcome will be. However, it is clear that China’s nuclear test has had a significant impact on the global political landscape.

1964 was a year of tension and uncertainty, but also of hope. The Chinese test was a symbol of the power of the masses, and it was a reminder that the atomic bomb was not a weapon of the superpowers alone.

In the end, it is up to the people of the world to decide the future of our planet.
China's Entry Into Nuclear Age Opens One More Big Road to War

By Peter Malkin

The kingdom of Cambodia was the only formally non-aligned nation that hurried to congratulate Communist China as, on October 17th, she set off her first atomic bomb, to the fact that the only Communist governments that congratulated China were, like Cambodia, geographically nearest to the already large Asian military giant.

One of the most significant reactions to the Chinese bomb is likely to be the failure of the leading sections of the Communist parties of the world to congratulate Mao for his bomb was part of the Sino-Soviet dispute, but a response to the world-wide anti-war feeling among the workers of the world.

"THE DEFENSIVE BOMB"

No amount of Chinese doubletalk about the "defensive" nature of China's entry into the imperialist nuclear club can possibly change the fact that the bomb breakthrough was achieved at the expense of the toiling millions who have not eaten for 15 years after the Communist took power.

Nor can the fact that "the spokesman for American imperialism", President Johnson, all too eagerly took advantage of the new standard of living of the Chinese masses to shed crocodile tears for them be used to hide the greater truth that socialism with Chinese characteristics is a crude and terrible distortion of Marxism-Leninism and war while their billion standards do not even begin to approach the industrial output of the United States.

The conclusion is one-irreconcilable with the Russian model of the socialistic nuclear attack, and no one who is interested in China's future can be deceived by the "Chinese model" of the socialistic nuclear attack, and no one who is interested in China's future can be deceived by the "Chinese model".

The World, 15 hours before Mao exploded his bomb, Author: The Pennington to the Krakow at Hiroshima, said: "The world at Hiroshima was at peace, but the world at Hiroshima was at war with which it was under the control of the new administration and mounted to almost the same extent as in the Soviet Union.

It was a very good deal for the Soviet Union, who had failed to do anything about it, and who now provided funds with $250 million in credits on their purchases and provided its Gaullist allies with markets for over $300 million in industrial plants to be exported to the Soviet Union.

West Germany expressed regret that France had broken the Brest agreement of the West German states. The French government of Britain had already offered to grant a 15-year loan to the Soviet Union for the amount of $800 million to buy a Siberian fiber plant.

The Soviet Union would benefit by acquiring cogenerated, synthetic rubber, textiles, paper, and other factory equipment, while the U.S. had refused to export in exchange for goods which Russia has in surplus.

(Coloured Talk Page 1)

The attitude of De Gaulle permitted him to disregard the proposed Franco-German axis, in order to leave the European Common Market or Germanhi in disarray, and to take up his position at the head of a 'new' economic community.

In striking out on all fronts at once, De Gaulle also chose to take this moment to threaten to leave the Nato alliance and to call on his nation to fight in the multilateral nuclear war force planned by Washington. The increasing national independence of De Gaulle France round its counterpart in the exclusion of Mao Tse-tung, whose appearance on the scene was a new development, and caused another agreement to send them one million tons of wheat.

De Gaulle had stood alone in the nuclear club for war as the only non-nation of nuclear powers who has refused to sign the nuclear test ban. He is now joined by Mao, who is not a member of the club. Together they call for a new co-operation, to set the two in a new direction to make a peaceful plan.

The De Gaulle will be the one next to contemplate the atmosphere of the world with deadly nuclear fallout. Above he has planned tests in the desert of the Western Pacific Ocean which will carry the fallout over the regions of the world that are the most heavily inhabited.

THE ROLE OF CHINA

The explosion of a nuclear device by the Pekin government launched an attack on the world. There were those who said it meant nothing, others who said it would change everything, and others who said it would change everything. The world was now in a state that the U.S. did not reach with its initial bomb.

Capability for bomb delivery can be delayed in military circles, but the impact of the event in political circles is another matter. There is no question that the countries surrounding China are deeply disturbed over the prospect of China's nuclear power.

There is no doubt that the Japanese government will condemn the U.S. for furnishing it to a nation of communist nations and to the world's industrial power by step.

Other countries are impressed that China was able to continue the work in the nuclear field, which started by the Russians but brought to a conclusion in less than four years after the U.S. withdrew from the program.

Professor Martin Bommer of the American Atomic Energy Labs at Princeton University and former editor of the Journal of the American Rocket Society, says: "We in the United States tend to think of the ballistic missile industry as perhaps least developed and least developed. This is not necessarily so, if the initial objective is merely to develop a medium-range strategic system of only moderate accuracy and modest yield numbers.

"China may play on the world market every type of instrument, metal, chemical and composite that is needed to build her rockets. . . ."

As for rocket accuracy, it is still a matter of some, either in theory or design.

All one needs is a craving hunger...
edge of English, French or German and a good collection of the best technical journals, periodicals, literature, etc.

"It is inconceivable that the Chinese started a program of weapons development without having started a simultaneous nuclear program and without having planned to fit the bomb to the rocket at the right time in the timetable," the report added. In fewer years than they think, China will have nuclear weapons that can reach all the points of interest in the United States.

SINO-SoviET DISPUTE

The order of Khrushchev has caused a speculation that a war could break out in the Middle East. Recent moves in the Middle East are further evidence of the truth in the speculation. None of the basic differences between Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung are yet resolved by the removal of Khrushchev.

The new leadership of the Soviet Union is, in all appearances, continuing with the basic policies of Khrushchev's "peaceful coexistence," and above all, the struggle to maintain first place as the leader of the Communist parties of the world.

Mao will not be forgotten for spoliating the Communist parties in almost every country. His plans for the East include the restoration of the old Chinese order not only in the United States, but against the Soviet Union.

Mao has not given up his claims to a Soviet or fascist dictatorship and there is no reason to believe that Khrushchev's policies in that regard are not shared by the present Soviet leadership.

The visit to Moscow of Chou En-lai may result in postponing the Dec. 19 meeting of the Communist parties of the world, which were scheduled to read the Chinese Communist Party out of the family of respectable communists, but the postponement of the meeting will only give for the thinnest center of communism... will not be successful.

It seeks quality, rather than with Khrushchev's botterrusticism, to achieve its national aims. From the first to last, Chou En-lai has made it clear that the price of lasting peace in the Communist International will be the abandonment of Russian leadership.

Despite the claims and pretensions of Mao Tse-tung that the main bone of contention between them is the Soviet Union is the one and only one causing the world revolution, he has done everything within his power to assist the Russian leaders, to the extent, we are not the weapons, the masses in their revolutionary street battles. Nuclear weapons are instruments of power politics of capital state or private. One cannot even exclude a possibility that Stalin will not do the same as well in the power struggle within his power base of the anti-capitalists who call themselves Communists.

THE MORAL OF IT ALL

The world is divided into those who support the uprising of the USSR and the ccp and those who support Khrushchev against the ccp.

The cc is not only a case of support for the ccpr but also for the ccp.
Conglomerate Mergers — or Big Business Gets Bigger

So popular are attacks on Big Business that the most reactionary elements of capitalism itself — big and little, ethnic and racial alike — have exploited this attitude as an issue to make. If the Business is not the very foundation of Big Government, it’s not the red, white and blue banner of “rugged individualism” being ostentatiously waved by Big Business itself.

In addition, however, of any possible release by the Administration of the proof of the concentration of economic power in the hands of a small minority of manufacturing corporations, the National Association of Manufacturers hurried to set out its own “case release.” “There is no such . . . that the government can assume that everyone who wants to be a small business proprietor can succeed regardless of his ability, and it’s about time to give up trying.”

All that this gratuitous release failed to mention was that it is not the unorganized business enterprise which is being gobbled up, but the successful one. No is it the government that is doing the gobbling up. It is Big Business, big business eating up small capital. To see just how biased big business is, just how high the pyramid on which the top ten corporations are sitting and holding it over the nation’s conscience, including Big Government, we must turn to the hearings before the Senate Anti-Trust and Monopoly Sub-committee.

BIG, BIGGER, BIGGEST

Dr. Cardon R. Muck, co-author of the classic The Modern Corporation and Private Property, thought the people would be shocked to know that the concentration of economic power, so graphically described in the old Temporary National Economic Committee (TNEC) report, had increased in concentration since 1938. He estimates that the 100 largest manufacturing corporations in 1929 controlled at least ... 25 per cent of all the net assets, the net land, buildings, and equipment of all manufacturing corporations.

As we move from the top 100 manufacturing corporations to the top 20, the concentration of economic power becomes more centralized still. The director of the Federal Trade Commission’s Bureau of Economics, Willard F. Smith, testified that the 20 titans among all manufacturing corporations in 1928 controlled 25 per cent of all assets.

What about the small businesses? Well, they are the 480,000 smallest manufacturers combined, or a like proportion of the 1 million or more companies. In group of two in manufacturing, in 1928 controlled 25 per cent of all assets and 25 per cent of all sales, net assets and patents after taxes, in terms of manufacturing corporations.

In 1938, regardless of the measure used, a relatively few immense corporations were the great bulwark of the financial strength of American manufacturing.

It is even more exciting as we move to the top of the pyramid.

Here are the assets of the top 10:

1. U.S. Steel ... $11.5 billion
2. General Motors ... $10.2 billion
3. J. P. Morgan ... $9.8 billion
4. U. S. Steel ... $6 billion
5. Gulf Oil ... $4.2 billion
6. Titanium ... $4.1 billion
7. Standard Oil (gas) ... $3.6 billion
8. Standard Oil (Ohio) ... $3.6 billion
9. U. S. Steel ... $3 billion
10. E. I. DuPont ... $3 billion

By far the 10 leaders will have notched that out of the 10 the oil companies who benefit from a mandement 27.5% depreciation allowance looters. Though President Johnson is not about in close up that loophole, the oil tycoons want to make sure that their monopolies are no more concentrated as well. Conglomeration, or, as these titans like to refer to their type of integration hold on the whole economy “diversification” deserves a second look.

THE NEW IN ECONOMIC POWER

As Goldwater looked toward power by “attacking” Big Government, as many a politician alone Roosevelt, FDR, and Franklin Dullahan!), he turned to the public agencies of “trust busting,” 

There being, the economic myths out of the jungle. Nevertheless, the trusts, far from having been broken, become even more powerful. As against the place of monopoly growth by way of buying out rival businesses during the Depression, the new post-World ++:

The growth of monopoly was by way of mergers with profitable companies who nevertheless deal with only a single product. Between 1913-1933 the 200 largest corporations that acquired no less than 1,500 businesses. Mr. Meuller had testified before Senate’s “monopoly” sub-committee that in the last five years corporations in the lucky $10 million plus class gobbled up less than 30 corporations a year whose earnings were 7.5 cents annually.

In a word, the growth of economic power was not internal growth, much less through “free competition,” but by taking over small, and often failing businesses. That is to say, the mergers were neither horizontal by one large company taking over another, nor even vertical by taking over related industries like Ford making its own steel or parts, but by taking over all sorts of “diversified” industries.

Thus GM doesn’t just make cars, it makes refrigerators and diesel locomotives. As Dr. Walter W. Ayres, of Indiana State University pointed out, Olin Mathieson sells everything from farm chemicals in spooling goods and trademark. There are some conglomerates that produce everything from helicopters to chicken feed.

PROFIT IS KING OR AT LEAST

Nothing so prevails the idea of the claim that we live in a “high consumer economy” as so-called “price leadership,” that is to say, the high, monopoly-administered prices that stay high, no matter what the “law of supply and demand” might say it should be, no matter if there is a recession or not. In other words, prices are stable in years when prices, no, not just stable, but high, high, high. In other words, there is anything “price leadership” does more efficiently than creating competition and not backing a lack of it, to the assurance of excessive profits.

One of the foremost positions of private capital saving state control in any way was to show how a state reformist allegatically disregards the profit motive, attributes to industry that industry was in “the nation’s interest.” There is no doubt that private capital would do nothing so much to repel the nation’s interest, for if it is anything “price leadership” does, it is to create a monopoly, not a lack of competition. The American Institute of Economics, “The conglomerate merger allows profits from one line of operations to subsidize a market failure on a single-line manufacturer who must rely on that single line to stay in business.”

The chief economist of the Anti-trust sub-committee, Dr. John M. Clark, said, “The modern over the large conglomerate corporation stems from its ability to use monopoly profits made in industries in which it has substantial monopoly power to destroy competition in other industries in which it is engaged.” Senator Hart said, “we would deplore a trend toward greater state control in this economic section . . . and while competition must be free, we cannot allow predatory practices to eliminate competition . . .”

Naturally Goldwater was too busy, resulting “state secrets” as a control of nuclear weapons to worry about Big Government’s concern over Big Business. Nor can we expect any such state of monopoly power from Johnson either. As stated in Marshall and Freedom (p. 500): “War or peace, the state does not diminish monopolies and trusts, nor does it diminish its own interference.”
Editorial Article

J. Edgar Hoover and Civil Rights

By Raya Dunayevskaya

The venemous, hate, racism and police-state mentality of J. Edgar Hoover burst into the open on November 19th as he addressed a conclave of white reporters rather than the more sophisticated and more inclusive regular news conferences of Washington reporters and columnists who may have challenged some of his more fanciful lies. But from the beaten track of his office and the quiet women sipping coffee, he could rock the rafters with gratuitous statements from his padded brain cells.

Designating the Warren Commission's Report as 'the most classic example of McCarthyism ever marched quarter-backing I have ever read,' he said that he considered it as 'brilliantly written' by the Supreme Court Justices, and that he was 'horrified' at the handling of the report which he said should have been handled with 'the utmost deliberation.'

ATTACK ON KINGS

The FBI Director's greatest display of spurious was reserved, however, for the civil rights movement and one of its leaders, Rev. Martin Luther King, whom he dared to call 'the most notorious liar in the country.'

That this was no non-recently a public issue against the King became clear as Hoover expanded himself. (Newsmen, Nov. 20, 1964.)

As against his vitriolic attack on Rev. King, Hoover singled out for praise none other than the most respected of all--Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., of the SCLC. "I cannot speak too high of the efforts of the civil rights leaders," he said. "I have been in their presence and I know they are the most conscientious and disciplined leaders in the United States."

The F.B.I. chief also expressed his concern for the safety of civil rights workers, and he praised the efforts of the SCLC in working towards desegregation.

The press that silenced Hoover's personal fascist outburst against the civil rights movement for his demagoguery, and the civil rights movement for its resistance to the FBI's "unqualified" activities and its role in promoting intelligence work and in helping to further the assassination of President Kennedy, was apparently silenced by the FBI's "special relationship" with the movement.

Offensive

J. Edgar Hoover got his territory the right hand man of the notorious Attorney-General Robert F. Kennedy, who installed the lawyer's name to the FBI in 1960 which thousands of "hate and foreign" agents had nothing to do either with "hate" or "foreign." It had everything to do with American wage workers trying to unionize and industrial unions, and better their conditions of labor and life.

The FBI's efforts to suppress the SCLC and SNCC, as well as the open strikes that year in steel and coal, and the rise of the first Negro organization (Garveyism), were reasons why capital's demands to hold up the secret police which differs in no fundamental sense from that in totalitarian lands.

Indeed, "Red summer 1964" is a description of the Russian Revolution, but of the blood that flowed on American streets. Caused by the KKK that followed the Negro North, there were a fantastic number of race riots—no less than 27 last year, and 67 at the time of 1961. The Negroes did not take all this lying down. They built an organization of millions—the first mass organization of Negroes in the country—under the leadership of Marcus Garvey.
And, whereas the majority were searching for a national philo-
osophy like that of the Prussian philosophers, the Socialists, the national hy-
 drau, the murderous lawless Palmer raids, and isolationism led by the Business Inter-
national, were the foundations of the open shop offensive. It took a Depres-
sion and a very nearly endless series of strikes finally to break the strength of the
Capital, and establish the C.I.O. in 1937.

Justice Charles Evans Hughes announced the situation on June
21, 1932: "We may well wonder, in view of the procedure now
established, whether constitutional government, as heretofore
maintained in this republic, could survive another great war even
victoriously waged."

THE PRESENT OFFENSIVE

To the extent that all the lawlessness of the former era
has been repeated, it is due, and to the fact that Hoover's
FBI has since become "a re-
spectable, investigatory agency,"
but to the political maturity of the American working class, on
the one hand, and, above all, to the fact that the Negro has
stayed South and still organized himself into a major force, and a
minority movement which has gained a momentum that no single
terror can stop. It is this which has midled Hoover's efforts.

We look, indeed, a repudiation of terror during World War II,
only this time the battle raged on the farms of Japan's des-
crnt who were thrown into con-
cession and compromise. The fact
that the whites were called "reunionists" and the blacks "terrorists"
either for their legality or bru-

Ever since 1948, as his letter to Attorney General, Civil Rights
Dept., 24 revealed, Hoover has been trying to withdraw from the
civil rights field. The 1940's were followed by the 1950's, and the
which time Hoover was too busy being a member of the delegation
of Joseph McCarthy to carry on his work of investigating poli-

crime and corruption. It is this local atmosphere
in the region which the Hoover has
self to himself as "filled with
terrorism, racketeering and red-on-red strife," and they
are all in the same category, as far as the Bureau's point of
view is concerned. Which accounts for the Bureau's streak of enthusiasm in the
investigation of all civil rights.

The truth is that Hoover has
been on a private rampage,
against the civil rights move-
ment ever since President Ken-
cy. In 1951, set up a Civil
Rights Commission which re-
ported on the statistical na-
ture of the FBI's work in the
South, and Attorney General
Robert Kennedy, charged it, to
record Hoover's that before his
departure put fully half of the
Department of Justice's annual budget,
and it is supposed to be
under the jurisdiction of the Department.

The result was that, instead of
the rackets whose 아래 is part
of Southern "culture" freeing any
fear of the FBI presence, it was the Freedom movement that
fled a veritable new conspiracy arise against it.

HOOVER, THE ZEALOT

So, finally, though they have not yet, a year after the event, found
the leaders who directed the Negro church in Alab-


A. Not only had Hoover not withdrawn any of his statements at the infamous Nov. 18 dis-
tory to women reporters, he rushed the following work to Chicago to block off, at Loyola
University against "racism and pressure group" which he
was "determined to stop by communication or general
urgencies." One any acquiescence in Hoover's line of the
word, "Communist," the said


5. As a prime architect of the political strategy of Ameri-
can racism from the 1930's on, Hoover could hardly be expected
to become, instead, a prime architect of civil rights in the
South or elsewhere in the

6. He did not even try to explain this aspect as opening an
office in Jackson, Miss., until
President Johnson instituted a special investigation, headed by

7. The former home of the U.S. Attorney General, Allen Dulaney, who recommended
7. No wonder the fugitives expect little to come from the FBI's penetration of the grand jury
which meets in January. They have no faith at all that the racial grand jury will convict the
white assassins.

MARAUD ACTIVITY

President Johnson is, of course, busy putting Hoover off the
book and he has, unfortunately, also succeeded in making
Revel, King to it. Nevertheless, despite Revel, King's contacts with Hoover, and the de-
briefing of some of the leaders of the civil rights movement
that their fire now, the youth who was not in it, while they have spoken out openly.

Thus the ANOC, woman in Atlanta, Georgia, The Student
Yvonne Jones wrote, "The FBI under Hoover has
been one of the worst
that stands and watches as Negroes
are beaten in Selma, Alabama,

8. The FBI under Hoover has come to mean, "the man" and the police state, until Negroes.
They felt that "it is

9. They felt that it is not only the self-activity of the masses that will assure the

10. They felt that it is not only the self-activity of the masses that will assure the

12. They felt that it is not only the self-activity of the masses that will assure the
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FREE SPEECH MOVEMENT AND 'THE COMMUNITY OF SCHOLARS'

By Raya Dunayevskaya

PART ONE

On Dec. 2, 800 students in the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley threatened to persuade the Chancellor of the University of California, Clark Kerr, to sign the university's code that appeared in the Student Senate's resolution.
and announced also that his appointed Faculty Committee on Student Conduct, now a Committee of the Academic Senate, would hear the cases of the suspended students. The FSM stated that if the Administration continued its refusal "to sit down and discuss issues" on the different interpretations of the Oct. 2 agreement, which they considered Chancellor Strong's interpretation, instead of the committee to whom the cases of the suspended students were to be submitted, and expanded the COP to include four FSM, however, be resistant against his interpretation of what constituted "unlawful acts," while the students contended that the question of legality and illegality were for the courts to decide. A move to "exercise our constitutional rights" was made by the students who refused hearing the trials.

Chancellor Strong disbanded the CPPA and the Dean's Office and a letter to 72 students, to the chagrin of a new FSU, which then joined the FSM: a newly formed teaching assistant's association. The FSU now moved against the graduate students. The FSU was busy collecting signatures on petitions which urged the Board of Regents to leave the question of "advocacy" to the courts to decide. On Nov. 20 the Regent's seemed to side with President Kerr on the question of "illegal" advocacy. When this was followed, during the Thanksgiving holidays, by suddenly restoring disciplinary action against Savio and others, the gathering storm broke. After a mass rally, on Dec. 2, 800 moved into Sproul Hall for a new strike. The move of the Administration to use police to settle its dispute with the students, the intervention of the Governor, the arrest of the student demonstrators, as we now know, brought about the student strike, and such massive support from the faculty, that it became the turning point for all concerned.

Just as the Faculty was propitious into the student dispute with the Administration, so the civil rights movement found that it was by no accident bounded by the issue of academic freedom. The FSU itself was propelled into a new stage of development, for the dispute of civil rights was inseparable from the dialectics of ideas. All the pivotal points suddenly became clear. The whole struggle, victory included, was put to the test and the ultimate issue of the struggle was the role of youth in a society, but to ideas and to reality. The right to free speech became a discussion on an alienation of society as a whole. The right to discipline became a question of human relationships. The dispute on concrete questions became a search for a total philosophy.

THE BANKRUPTCY OF THOUGHT

PROFILES OF CLARK KERR AND LEWIS FEUER

Long before the Berkeley battle broke out, UC President Kerr wrote of the university as a "multi-vocality" with government research, business, military, and scientific enterprises all being part of the "new" academic complex. Such in his own words at Harvard in 1960, "The voice of the University, and in his other book, "Industrialism and Industrial Man," he spoke of the "inexplicability of intellectuals and the need to do away with heavy torments so that the university can become part of society" i.e., to stabilize the militarized economy run by responsible "managers."

Now, whether he claims he was merely describing what is, and advocating what should be, the point is that, once the actual struggle, as recent events in "his" university show, society meant itself to be a meek, unresistant, but ready in two by class struggles, catch in the power struggles academic as well as economic and political crises. President Kerr showed which part of "society" he was for, and he had a "theory" and thereby not part of his concept of society. It turned out to be the students and even the faculty. The students, on the other hand, considered "society" to be the struggles for civil rights and freedom of thought, especially once the struggle possible in the inner world is the struggle for the nation - and they are not too participate in that conflict. They rejected Kerr's concept of the "multi-vocality" along with its IBM and UC students as if they were unknown. Their feeling of alienation can be sensed from one of the placards which read: "Don't read, aloud, evaluate, or multidiscussion!"
FREE SPEECH MOVEMENT AND THE COMMUNITY OF SCHOLARS

BY BAYA DUNAYEVEYKAYA

PART TWO

The apparent task in the student revolt at the University of California at Berkeley is the replacement of an outgoing chancellor, Martin Meyerson, and the need to resolve the question of the future of the campus. In the case of students who were at Sproul Hall in December, presents an opportunity for a second look at the significance of the Free Speech Movement. Both as an act and as a serious challenge to thought, the FSM has shaken up not only the academic community but the world outside. It just as the continuous Negro struggle for equality exposed the frailties of American democracy, so the student revolt at Berkeley exposes the fragility of the academic freedom.

Professor Book from New York University who, during the McCarthy period, found reasons why academic freedom should be restricted within the context of the Cold War, now tells us that academic freedom is not an issue, but a tool to be applied to areas where there are more to learn in.<ref>22 He failed to explain exactly how the political invasion of the campus contributed to the University of California being a deadening of learning. Another aspect of the same struggle—Professor Foner—concluded the police for their "moderation." Before the University Administration decided to elaborate this myth into a legend, it is necessary, first of all, to re-establish the facts of the case.

STEVEN SCHMIDT

The only reporter who was in Sproul Hall, Joel L. Finley, has a very ugly story to tell. 24

"The only way to purge the nightmare of that black Thursday is by getting the ugly images out of my brain and down on paper... The question might be asked, why do you need 800 copiers to cope with 300 persistently resisting kids? This was no prison riot; yet from the police response, you would have thought they were handling convicts, not students... Make no mistake, the cops weren't just doing their duty.

"This (Students) were deliberately handed down the stairs as their backs and hairstyles, hair and ears were pulled—all to the immense amusement of the Oakland police. And last night they think a counter-strike, you look at the cops themselves... They didn't drag us down town to find the side of their heads, it was like being given a little a shower—they bounced more away than they did. We should do this to the police. The 1st generation, that's first, then throw 'em in the bus.... The cops were chasing us instead of being chased by us. They went down to the stairs, some head first, some feet first, standing on them with their heads looking. They were looking for a fight. They were out of the way, and getting...."

At the end of the cops get the right to plagerize papers over windows no reporters can't see what's going on. That's a new one: newspapers used as a device to keep the facts from getting the truth. Law and order may be preserved—contend the authorities—but the newspapers, the administration, etc. etc. But law and order maintain the status quo, the status quo, the status quo—be it in the classroom or in the public mind. And the law and order of the status quo are not necessary in the making of the status quo.

Here is a final point. The old 'deplorable' 'left wing dope' stereotype has already been raised. Since there is sex appeal, a Communist idea, or the right to mount political and social activities, a Communist concept! I thought precisely the opposite. If any good comes out of this (and I'm still able to think it) it will be that on one issue has emerged that must be addressed: You can crush the idealist, but you cannot crush the idea. You cannot crush the work. You cannot crush the thought, or the force of the FSM, to agree with the truth. But law and order, and the status quo, is necessary in the making of the status quo.

"If any good comes out of this (and I'm still able to think it) it will be that on one issue has emerged that must be addressed: You can crush the idealist, but you cannot crush the idea. You cannot crush the work. You cannot crush the thought, or the force of the FSM, to agree with the truth. But law and order, and the status quo, is necessary in the making of the status quo.

"If any good comes out of this (and I'm still able to think it) it will be that on one issue has emerged that must be addressed: You can crush the idealist, but you cannot crush the idea. You cannot crush the work. You cannot crush the thought, or the force of the FSM, to agree with the truth. But law and order, and the status quo, is necessary in the making of the status quo.
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will die rather than be standardized, replaceable and irrelevant."19

Jack Weinberg expressed a similar point. "One of the greatest
socialills of this notion is the absolute refusal... of all of its
members to examine seriously the presuppositions of the establish-
ment... It is their marginal social status which has allowed stu-
dents to become active in the civil rights movement and which has allowed
them to create the Free Speech Movement... They become activists
and a new generation, a generation of radicals, emerges.20

What needs to be stressed now is that a new generation of radi-
cals is born not only through such activities as the sit-ins, the picket-
tlines, the strike, but also through the activity of thinking. It should
be unnecessary to add that the mental alertness and social anima-
tion, more than the marginal social status, propelled the students into
the FSM and such new fangled forms of revolt as "civil disobedience."
Of course, they "took it" from the civil rights movement, but placing
it in an university campus means that the whole spurious socialist
community, not only at Berkeley, will never be the same.

The philosophical aspect, moreover, adds a new dimension to the
very movement which gave the FSM its impetus: the civil rights
movement. It is this movement which must be redefined, not even in
academia.

Our age of state-apologism with the administrative mentality
inherent in it, leaves us, now and ever again, that despite the
appearance of opposition, reconciliation and activism can and do
exist to form the very essence of modern intellectuals, including those who do see the
ills of the world and do oppose the status quo.

Even in the intellectual stature of Jean-Paul Sartre found
it much easier to declare the Communist Party to be "the only revolu-
tionary party"—and that, though he was witness to the outright
counter-revolutionary suppression of the Hungarian Revolution
of 1956—than to undertake the challenge to thought once it was
designated as "political." This, moreover, is not only due to the
fact that it is easier to drift responsibility for leadership to the
party. It is, above all, due to the fact that it doesn't tell the intellec-
tuals stories how to go below, to the surface of ideas, to the masses, and not only for "inspiration" but to work
out the essential ideas in their manifold histories and philosophies
as well as morally creative, aspects of today's man.

Now, that the students have experienced the urgency of the
struggle's call, and have given the struggle their own stamp, a new path
to Marx's humanism has opened up: today's young activists are seeking
to break the bonds of Woodfill's Phillips' admonition: "Never
again be ours the fastidious scholarship that shrinks from rude
contact with the real thing."21

(For Footnotes see p. 7, cols. 1 and 2)

Footnotes for "Free Speech Movement," pp. 1 and 5.
(1) "Freedom to Learn But Not to Think" by Sidney Rock (The
(2) "Conflict at Berkeley: An Inside Story" by Joel L. Pinto.
(4) Other than analyzing Feuer's "scholarship" in the specific
instance of his accursed writings on the Berkeley revolt as we did
in Part One, (S.N.A., January 2, 1965) at least passing reference
must be made to his scholarship as analyzed by learned sources long
before he wrote a single in which he was a participant. Thus,
Professor David Horowitz, the one historian who has written the
best documented and truly scholarly work on Soviet Marxism
and Natural Science, 1917-1935, has had to show that Communist authors
did not go unhidden, "in accordance with their philosophy," to create
conclusions. Non-Marxist authors have contributed to the confusion
by an excess of boldness, by the prolifery that many have shown
towards unaided judgments on the basis of insufficient evidence.

One author, for example, writing in a scholarly journal, based a
history of the theory of relativity in Soviet physics and philosophy on
three "sources" two of which were merely ambiguous passing refer-
cences to Einstein's theory in Soviet articles on other subjects. The
author referred to is none other than Louis S. Feuer.

Since that was written, Feuer was nevertheless sent as part of
the cultural exchange with Russia and since his few months' stay
there he has written endlessly (and so have they against him: See
Yeoung Shin, (1-65) and just as ignorantly so that, once again,
he has aroused the ire of specialists in the Soviet field. Thus,
Professor Joseph Buczak has had to write in the Black Review 10-65,
completing that Feuer "is either unequipped with such studies,
or unwilling to acknowledge that they exist" and, after citing about
a dozen that deal with the same subject as Feuer, Buczak concludes:
"Should I go on? I can procure other studies. There is nothing particu-
larly wrong if his article is to be only his personal impression. But
since his footnote refers to a few "other" works in that field, I am
wondering whether this is really fair to the whole body of scholar-
ship.

And this is the representative of the "West" that is supposed
to win the struggle for the minds of men away from Communism.
(5) "What the Students Want" by Stephan Wilkinson, The
New Leader, 1-65.
(6) I am using my own translation of the Humanist Essays which
first appeared as Appendices to the 1958 edition of MARXISM AND
FREEDOM, but these essays can also be gotten in paperbound editions
of Erich Fromm's Marx's Concept of Man.
(7) The speech was printed in Humanist No. 2, Dec. 64, under
the headline "An End to History."
(8) "The Free Speech Movement and Civil Rights" by Jack
(9) For a detailed development of Sartre's philosophical works,
see my book's Search for Method in Undergraduate Marxism, News &
Letters, Detroit, Mich.
(10) Quoted in American Civilization on Trial, A Statement by
the National Editorial Board of News & Letters (Detroit, Mich.
6234).
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EDITORIAL

End the War in Viet Nam!

The bombings of North Viet Nam by American planes did more to escalate the war in Viet Nam. They were actually steps toward a new world war. No strong is the anti-war feeling throughout the world. The fact is that in one that the Communists were not alone in their demonstrations protesting the provocative actions of the United States. Throughout the world, the United States, thousands and tens of thousands demanded an end to the war toward a new world war.

CONSPIRACY BY WHOM?

The Administration's present that it "had to" retaliate the Vietnamese infiltration of a U.S. air base at Pleiku, South Viet Nam, because "the Hanoi regime" was testing its "will and purpose" fails to answer why the United States entered the roles of the war by formally entering the Vietnamese with Hanoi! And how did it "happen" that three carriers of the Seventh Fleet were so conveniently in the South China Sea just when they were needed for "reprisals against unprovoked attacks"? Since the Administration's own descriptions of the Vietnamese military attack shows that the South Vietnamese guerrilla could not have pasted the American military base without the active cooperation of the people of South Viet Nam. Isn't it obvious that the South Viet

NATIONALISM AND THE IMPETUITY OF THE UN

For the sake of President Johnson has become more quiet than ever. But no one expects that the United States or a new world war. The United States is abroad. Instead, we are confronted with unbridled aggression and unbridled nukes confronting this nation while the military are trying to push us over the edge into the abyss of a possible nuclear war. The unceasing balance is backed up by trying to fool the near-emergence of the United States, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America a new type of imperialist rule: neocolonialism.

In face both of the cases demonstrations against the American actions. In one case, of even some nations of the British Government that negotiations could not be started unless the Viet Cong attacks on the American military in South Viet Nam were first stopped. The liberal New Statesman went as hysterically far in London as any. The fact is that the New Statesman, page editorial, it wrote: "The road to New Delhi lies through Salisbury." Following this, the Soviet Government that "even the Indian Prime Minister and it is not clear what the British establishment: The Communists and their allies could move into Malaysia from the north, to reinforce their successors from the south."

Now it is true that the New Statesman is calling, not for war, but for an "emergency," but no one has thought of the possibility that the New Statesman is calling, not for war, but for an "emergency" New Statesman has been called. The latter in my previous column that this negotiation could be started "inside or outside" the UN. All that he has to add to the UN is very far indeed! As the old song went, "He cannot admit the truth without revealing that such unlikely bedfellows as Gromyko and de Gaulle have brought about the impotence by so simple a device as not paying dues." And hardly any one has noticed that, though in the dual-language era, at the time, there were the following: the United States, thousands and tens of thousands demanded an end to the war toward a new world war.
Dear Reader:

The barbarism which threatens civilization in South USA reached such a stage of savagery on Sunday, March 7, with the gassing and clubbing of unarmed Negroes -- men, women and children -- that it set into motion thousands of new forces for the freedom movement. Many had never before been roused to action, even by the brutal murders of Schwerner, Chaney and Goodman in Mississippi last summer. But those who had kept their eyes closed to Magnolias Jungle justice by blaming it on "individuals" found they could no longer do so, when the storm troopers, under direct order of Gov. Wallace, displayed their bestiality as the arm of "the law." Coming directly after the death of Jimmy Lee Jackson, shot in the stomach by one of these storm troopers, the March 7 atrocity became the act that aroused the conscience of the nation. The courage and determination of John Lewis, SNCC Chairman, and leader of the march, who had been clubbed and beaten and yet rose to ask for another march, became a crucible out of which was forged new forces for the freedom Movement.

At the same time counter forces were at work. We do not mean the openly counter-revolutionary actions of Gov. Wallace, who had planned the Selma outrage. We refer to the many ways in which the Washington administration began its attempts "to correct the American image" abroad by trying "to stop bloodshed." This did not mean trying to stop the storm troopers who were shedding it, but the non-violent masses whose blood was being shed as they fought for their elemental rights. Thus, first the Administration advised against a new demonstration; then it invited the Federal court order to stop it; then there was an open appeal from the President; and when it became quite clear that nothing could stop the newly mobilized forces and that Rev. King would lead a new march of 2500, the Administration persuaded Rev. King to follow a Federal plan -- an agreement unknown to most of the demonstrators who had flocked to Selma to continue the struggle.

When Rev. James Reeb was clubbed to death, from behind, by white racists after the peaceful march, the great new demonstrations that followed across the land were in large measure united. New forms were spontaneously evolved -- such as the sit-in at the White House, the lay-down on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, D.C., and the all-night vigils in such widely separated places as Selma, Alabama in the streets in front of Brown's Chapel, which lasted for five long days and nights, and in Los Angeles before the Federal Building. These demonstrations also revealed that the violence of "law and order" is very little different North or South.

The yellow roses from the President, and the crocodile tears from Selma's City Council to the widow of the murdered Rev. James Reeb, cannot bespeak the urgency for the civil rights movement to evaluate the new stage the freedom struggle has reached, and the ever-renewed pressure of the Administration to channelize them into legal traps. There have been too many martyrs, too many memorials, there has been too much achieved in daring, self-activity and momentum, for the movement to entangle itself once again in legalism. Rev. King is tied up in a court case at the very moment when, from below, there are both mass outpourings, and smaller vigils which demonstrate the unflagging determination of the ranks to continue. In Selma, freedom fighters have spent days and nights out in bitter rain on hard sidewalks, surrounded
not only by armed police, but by what they immediately named "the Berlin rope", stringing up by Selnas "Public Safety Director" to keep them in one single place. Throughout the country the ranks are devising new forms of revolt -- while the Administration keeps trying to divert everything to the enactment of still one more bill.

The pattern is all too familiar now. After Bull Connor's display of brutality, use of fire-hoses, vicious police dogs and cattle prods against the mass demonstrators in Birmingham in 1963, we got the Civil Rights Bill passed in 1964. This was deemed sufficient for some civil rights leaders to call off mass demonstrations and to concentrate on "voting for Johnson". But the counter-revolution did not stop for a single instant in its concerted attempt to turn back the clock of history. Though the Mississippi murders might horrify others, they knew the killers would be acquitted by Federal district judges on the fantastic ground that the heinous crimes were State, not Federal violations. Now the Alabama storm troopers and possemen, led by Al Lingo and Sheriff Clark, have unleashed against unarmed Negro men, women and children gas which has left serious chemical burns, bull whips which beat them as they ran back, clubs which beat them as they fell, and horses which trampled into the ground. And the Governor who created this new bloodshed, not only dared ask the President to stop the civil rights "agitators" from interfering with his "law and order", but after meeting with the President, dared continue with his ordered defiance -- and called the shots against the very same type of police brutality in the North.

The revulsion against the latest outrages has forced even the moderate Roy Wilkins to state that there is a limit to patience and non-violence, that if the Administration can't establish order, the Negro will have to, for it is "American to be attacked." But -- now that the President has spoken out "strongly" and presented us with still one more bill on voting (nearly a century after the 14th and 15th amendments, following a civil war, had already established that elementary right) -- the question is: Will the movement which demands freedom now once again be diverted?

This is the turning point which must become a point of departure for weighing carefully and elaborating prudently, not ways to avoid, but ways to unite with action, to work out a theory of liberation which will meet the challenge of this movement from below, from the actual struggles for freedom.

The proof that this is what the movement is searching for is that so many youth, South and North, are not waiting for any leadership to call for some specific act before embarking on it themselves. This week-end saw mass demonstrations which reached more and more thousands in more and more cities across the country, and alongside these mass outpourings have appeared smaller groups who have devised new ways of continuous challenge, not only to State but to Federal authorities, acting on their own rather than under any established civil rights leadership. From Selma to Los Angeles, from Washington D.C. to Wisconsin, they are continuing the struggle with or without official sanction -- and they are continuing discussion as well, not only in meeting halls, but in small huddles all night vigils.

The fact that not only the civil rights movement, but the general public feels that legalism is insufficient, is proved by their near-disregard of the Supreme Court decision which has just struck down Louisiana literacy laws as "a trap". A decade ago the Supreme Court decision on desegregation in the schools was hailed as a "milestone". Today, the new "historic" decision brought hardly a notice from anyone. The Administration is well aware of the public feeling that one more law means only one more loophole for the Southern lawyers. That is why
the Administration is trying to present the new bill as something self-triggering -- but it cannot trigger any new social order in South USA, since the South is, in fact, the material product of Northern capital.

The leadership of the civil rights movement may think that it is only by not facing that fact that they have attracted the new allies who have turned out by the thousands. In part this is true, but only in part. The greater truth is that this numerically highest point is, at the same time, a turning point for the civil rights movement, which is now faced with possible isolation from its own militant ranks and those outside who are taking independent action, as well as carrying on discussion on various theories of liberation. Unless the leadership listens to these new voices and recognizes that the momentum of the movement will not allow for any retreat to legalism; unless it becomes a participant in the elaboration of an underlying philosophy instead of merely using it as a slogan, the leadership itself will be left by the wayside. What is needed now is a unity of theory and practice in which the masses are not only participants in action, but in thought. Instead of a never-ending dialogue with the Administration, it is time that the leadership of the civil rights movement started one with its own ranks.

The dialogue must no longer be put off on the grounds that “we are an activity organization.” Thinking, too, is an activity. An awareness of the significance of an action is itself a step toward total freedom. It is imperative that what has been implicit in the freedom struggles all along, now become explicit. Dialogue with the ranks involved in direct actions can make it so. Nothing else will fully arm them in their struggle against the forces of reaction. Nothing else will transform the goal of freedom into a reality.

-- THE NATIONAL EDITORIAL BOARD
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THEORY OF ALIENATION: Marx’s Debt to Hegel

April 1965

Marx’s debt to Hegel is a complex and far-reaching influence. Hegel’s idealism and dialectical thought provided Marx with a framework to understand the historical development of society. Marx incorporated Hegel’s concepts of alienation and the dialectic into his own theory of human history, emphasizing the role of class struggle and the necessity of revolution.

H. 3. CRITIQUE OF, AND INDIFFERENCE TO, THE HEGELIAN DIALECTIC

The Communist Manifesto, which is not the only one who try to grasp the unity of Marxian and Hegelian philosophy. Academicians who think that Marx is an agent of progress, for he transformed Hegelian dialectics into the point of non-recognized, if not outright persecution. Whether this dialectic is still called "the shock of recognition" will come upon us at the end of discussion remains to be seen, but it is clearly discernible in Marx’s intellectual development reveals two basic stages of alienation and transcending Hegel. The first took place during the period of his break with the Young Hegelians, and thus in them the revolution that they were demonstrating the illusion. It was the time when they broke with both his Hegelian Philosophy of Right, and the Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic.

There was nothing mechanical about Marx’s later materialist and outlook. Social science determined circumstances, but it is not a conclusion that is not evident. Marx was not one to forget his intellectual independence either in classical political economy or philosophy. Although he had transformed both into a new world outlook, rooted activity in the actual struggles of the day. The sources remained the law of value of Smith and Ricardo, and Hegelian dialectics. Of course Marx criticized Hegel sharply for treating objective history as if that were the development of some world-spirit, and analyzing self-development of mind as if ideas floated somewhere between heaven and earth. As if the brain was not in the head of the body of man living in a certain period and at a specific time. Indeed Hegel himself would be incomprehensible if we did not keep in front of our minds the historical perspective he lived—of the French Revolution and Napoleon. And, no matter how abstract the language, he was always quite human.

Marx’s Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic is at the same time a critique of the materialist critique of Hegel, including Feuerbach, who had treated “the negation of the negation only as the contradiction of philosophy” (p. 151).

Marx reveals, contradiction, that principle is to the expression of the movement of all alienation in his heart form.

III. THE HUMAN DIMENSION

Of course it is true that Hegel worked out all the contradictions in thought, such as the latter were the only function of the forerunner no more than “show” Marx maintains that they are both as real as life. Throughout his greatest theoretical work, Capital, I’m jumping ahead for the moment to the immediate stage of Marx’s relationship to the dialectic—throughout that great work, Marx sustains the continuous effort of commodities, not only because relations of men are depicted as things, but especially because human relations under capitalism are so pervasive that it is not apparent that is indeed what they really are: Machine is master of men, not man of machine.

Marx’s main point is that the driving force of the dialectic was himself, not just his theory, but the whole world; his beginning with the alienated man at the point of production and that, whereas bourgeois ideology, because of the will to produce a false ideology because they must define the status quo and are “pioneers of the falsification of commodities” the proletariat, because of its role in production is the “negative principle” driving Marx toward a resolution of contradictions.

In the Theory of Philosophy Hegel has written his book with more than enough from through slavery that man acquired freedom. Again, the idea of “freedom” was not Marx’s discovery, but Hegel’s. What Marx did was to designate practice as the class struggle activity of freedom.
the proletariat. In Hegel's theory, too, praxis stands higher than
the “Ideal of Creation” because it has “not only the dignity of
the universal but is the simply practical.”

It is true that Hegel himself threw a mystical veil over his
philosophy by treating it “as a closed ontological system. But it
would be a complete misunderstanding of Hegel's philosophy were we
to think that his Absolute is either a mere reflection of the separa-
tion between philosophy and the world of material production,
or that his Absolute is the empty absolute of pure or intellectual
intuition of the subjective idealists from Fichte through Schelling,
whose type of here-unity of subject and object—as Prof.
Bollas has so brilliantly phrased it—“possessed objectivity at the
price of being mummified.”

Whether, as with Hegel, Christian life is taken as the point of
departure, or whether—en with Marx—the point of departure is
the material condition for freedom created by the Industrial Revolu-
tion, the essential element is self-evident: man has to fight to
gain freedom; thereby it is revealed “the negative character” of
modern society.

Now the principle of negativity was not Marx's discovery;
he merely named it “the living word”; the discovery of the prin-
ciple was Hegel's. In the end, Spirit itself finds that it no longer
is antagonistic to the world, but is indeed the dominating spirit of
the community. As Hegel put it in his early work, “The
absolute moral totality is nothing else than a people . . . (and)
the people who receive such an element as a natural principle have
the mission of applying it.”

The humanism of Hegel may not be the most obvious char-
acteristic of that most complex philosophy, and, in part, it was
hidden even from Marx, although Lenin in his day caught it even in
the simple description of the Doctrine of the Nation “as the realm
of Subjectivity and freedom.” Or man achieving freedom not as
a “possessed,” but a discretion of his being.

It is the discretion of the human personality which Marx
saw in the historical struggles of the proletariat that would arise
and for all put an end to all class divisions and open up the vast
potentials of the human being so alienated in class societies,
so degraded by the division of mental and manual labor that not
only is the worker made into an appendage of a machine, but the
scientist builds on a principle which would lead society to the edge
of ruin.

One hundred years before Hiroshima, Marx wrote “To have
not both for science and other for life is a埠ed, a lie.” We
have lived this lie for so long that the fate of civilization, not
merely smoothness, but literally, is within shift of a nuclear
holocaust. Since the very survival of mankind hangs in the balance
between the East's and the West's nuclear terror, we must, this
time, under the pressure of death, unite theory and practice in the
struggle for freedom, thereby abolishing the division between
philosophy and reality and giving rise to the urgency of “evolving”
philosophy, that is to say, making freedom a reality.

April 1945
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Arab Sides With Nasr on Israel
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The Inhumanity of the U.S. Occupation of Dominica
By Raya Dunyevskaya

The new stage of decacy is an attrition of U.S. imperialism’s occupation of Saint Domingue in its total disregard of human life. Having, first, infringed on Grenada’s resources, it now seeks to unleash a counter-revolution against the very nearly bloodless and very nearly successful April 24 revolution, via the seizing of the capital and the loss of 1,000 lives on the ground. President Johnson took to the air waves and spoke unctuously of “a popular democratic revolution committed to democracy and social justice.” This was but prelude to announcing that it had oversight (turned over to a near "Communist takeover" and “therefore” required oversight) dispatch of U.S. marines.

The G.)P. PARROTS WHAT WE DICTATE

The next stage of this globally versioned counter-revolution called for acquiring an OAS foothold irrespective of the U.S. violation of its charter, or in mention of the violation of the sovereignty of the Dominican Republic. Our only President get approval for an "Inter-American peace force" by the very same sterling democracies as Haiti and the C.I.A. military brainchild, Guatemala.

Presently the OAS foothold of U.S. occupation of Dominica has fallen off as "its peace forces"—mainly American paratroopers now that the marines have been sent home—shut its way deep into rebel territory, killing 70 mostly non-combatants, wounding 200, taking 500 prisoners, torching its way into private homes, and then declaring, as "its. 56 blocks of the rebel zone.

This was followed by the OAS going into the countryside where they found uncounted grisly murders in shallow graves exactly at the spot, where the Dominican people, who had bitterly and persistently complained of its military junta’s atrocities, said they would be halted. Despite this proof of the Nazi demeanor of the U.S.-supported Imbert junta, the OAS has thus far dared declare that there was "no proof" as to who committed the massacre of all who stood in the junta’s way—a declaration of a boy-soldier child and one man who was so badly mutilated that no identification of any sort was possible.

The U.S. government remains silent about the brutality of the Imbert men, even when this concerns an American citizen. If it did concern a North American, we would be an uncensored story about it. And yet, in Santo Domingo, on May 21, an American citizen, Andrew Giberti Garcia, of East Bay, Puerto Rico, found his way back to the American lines only after he had been kept for 15 days in a cell about 6 by 8 feet, in which 12 were crowded against and even on top of each other. They were subjected to inhuman treatment and other forms, and one man was wounded at badly that he died. Their crime was that they were accused of being Communists, one of whom was as Communist as Garcia, whose protestation that he was an American citizen merely got the reply: "You dirty Communist."

In all, say Garcia, more than 500 prisoners were being held under "bestial conditions." He himself had received injuries on the head and the body. Yet no action was taken on this, and the report to L. A. T. A., Washington Post News Service who filed the story had to add: "It was not immediately known if the United States will protest to the Imbert regime."

THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF

Outside of the lie that it was "only after" President Johnson had "proof" of "Communist domination" of the popular revolt that U.S. marines were dispatched to the Dominican Republic, U.S. imperialist’s return to peaceful diplomacy can be seen from the fact that the President逆转 his own admission for a coalition government with representatives of the "popular democratic revolution committed to democracy and social justice.”

Obviously, it serves as a righting and treachery on the part of McGeorge Bundy to be so involved with the democratic air in Santo Domingo as to believe the President’s hypocritical speeches and follow the death threat to his legal conclusion, then the only sure place to set U.S. policy, to its occupation as well as to its invasion phase, in the inner recesses of the Pentagon. The tragedy is that the modern Irish Hap, armed to the teeth not merely with ambition, but with the most destructive weapons in the world is our Commander-In-Chief.

To those who followed developments it was clear, from the start that the very day of the near-success of the people’s revolt—April 25—was the day of U.S. imperialism’s decision that it should not succeed, no matter what it took, either to cover up U.S. intervention or, if this did not work, to be ashamed to stand before the world stark naked. The stop hypocritical speeches of President Johnson cannot hide the fact that his true air in Dominica is to carry on a war of attrition against the people, to "Hush off" their discussion with U.S.-supported Trujillo without Trujillo. And Johnson earns little for the means he has to achieve this unholy goal. Those wishing to read the Administration’s precise maneuvers for cover-up should read "The Roots of the Dominican Crisis" by Theodore Zygier—who will really be in the May 29th issue of The New Leader, which is not exactly a Communist publication. In its June 1st issue it carried Juan Borch’s story, "A Tale of Two Nations."

Far from being discredited by the wild corruption of the military junta that have transformed the highest echelons into millionaires overnight, but kept the people in abject and permanent poverty, President Johnson has been all too happy to use them for his own ends, and lanzas on finding them on the Dominican people. Not having succeeded with "We are not a gang installed" Trujillo’s insane Imbert, who was the architect of Trujilloism without Trujillo.

In Washington is getting up a new ballet—Baltazar for president, the same Baltazar who was president both under Trujillo and for his assassins. President Johnson will try anything, even moving at all, except that which the Dominican people want—a return to Constitutional government and the only Dominican president Juan Bosch—who was over daily elected president against overwhelming odds of the combined forces of the military junta, then in power, the hand-lining oligarchy that is equally rich and equally corrupt, Penington support, and a vicious slander campaign charging "Communism"—elected by the peasants, the urban poor, the lower middle class, elected overwhelmingly.

Neither the fact that Juan Bosch, in his seven months of power, did nothing to meet the military, and even moved the way for his own downfall, nor the fact that he is but the point of a course, which will square him in the eyes of either the Dominican military junta who reverted both his reforms and his own integrity, or in the eyes of the U.S. Commander-In-Chief, who does to let the true-blood revolutionary take their place. In the U.S., as in Dominica, nothing scares a ruling class more than the bears in the hands of civilians, and those the people now have, something they didn’t have under Bosch. It is not that the bears are any match for U.S. might. It is that they are a symbol of a people relying on their own mass strength. Destiny in the hands of the masses themselves in any Latin American country—how can the electric of Latin America. But the situation is very sick such an erratically, our Commander-In-Chief prefers closing all avenues for a genuine social revolution, even up to the ears of attraction in Dominica, even if thereby he becomes a greater breeder of Communism in this hemisphere than Castro ever was.
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SPHERES OF INFLUENCE AND PROTEST MOVEMENTS

Washington is also backing the fact that either Big Powers will get away with the counter-environmental in the Dominican even as it let Russia get away with it in Hungary, and China in Vietnam. The same is the case with the U.S. and the interposition of the middle powers is as it were a signal to the world. Unless the point of contention is either an integral element of its national interests, it is foreign to the scopes of the conflict. In the case of the geographical differences of the natural resources available to the two states, it is foreign to the Chinese case. Where the conflict interests of another state still have a bearing on the way in Vietnam, China is numerosous, powerful, weak, that is to say, bad and offensives, and they have a bearing on the way in the Dominican Republic, which is totally unoccupied, but not pivotted in its protest movements with the "aggressive country." Thus, where the demonstrationst are mutually facing into the way in Vietnam, it is for this. Just this protest which would thereby become as crux as an opportunity of making a judgment on American revolucions.

Outside of direct struggles, such as strikes for different conditions of labor and Negro struggles for full equality, no struggles for freedom are so closely related to the struggles in Latin America. For it is by its imperialist adventures and not just by the "expanding frontier" that America can capitalize on the prevalence of the proceedings of the American Revolution. The Andes was one of the highest world civilizations when it was a part of the Aymara empire. The Spanish and Portuguese laid waste to a continent that had its own volition both in its agriculture and in its ancient civilization. Peru alone the Incan Empire had supported its economy, and the country was the granary of the world and of people that new characteristics that influenced it. The first plundering by the second plundering by the Spanish was followed by the second plundering by American and German empires. The superimposition of American and Spanish (or the acquisition of Great Britain). The Monroe Doctrine that protected the Americas from European imperialism has not been returned, but the United States' dollar imperialism is the opening of the American continent, and the industrialized Latin America. For it was for this, and not for liberating the Monroe Doctrine was designed.

The tragedy of Latin America Is that Is by "benevolence" proving the one that from a Spanish and Portuguese subjugated the native population in the native colonies and devastation of the British by depleting the country of its gold. Not even Castro has had the courage to expose the true Marxist, and he did not want the first 1920 revolutions from Spain and Portugal. While these are in the twelve military dictators that later became least-petit presidents of American imperialism, the result is that one of the famous battles and a genuine social revolution in the 20th century. (Cuba did not get its freedom from Spain until the end of the 19th century.)

"Progressive Latin America" today is at almost total economic stagnation, with its economic "growth" being at a slower pace than even before it was in 1850, with more than 50 percent of the families in rural areas living below the poverty line and the income shortage is so staggering that fully 45 million Latin Americans have no place to live at all. (See the 1956 study made by the Economic Commission for Latin America of the U.N.)

What we did not know to stem in relating to the ruthlessness of the native ruling class is that now that President Johnson is relying millions that the Administration will pour into Latin America will all go to the pockets of the rulers, who may well indulge in odd moments. In some metropolis on their own. All the more important, therefore, are the acts of inter-American solidarity from this end of the continent.

INTER-AMERICAN SOLIDARITY

MUST BEGIN WITH THE WORKING PEOPLE

From Guatemala to Panama, from Brazil to Bolivia, and from Peru to Dominica we seem to be witnessing the reversal of the trend to popular revolutions in the post-World War II period, which got rid of military junta and limited oligarchies and began the road to independence. At the same time, a dysyntony of social and ideas emerged, life itself, while thought in the United States plummeted downward into McCarthyite reaction. In a word, it became crystal clear that while Latin America may be economically underdeveloped, it was the United States that had a monopoly of underdeveloped intellectuals.

Today, on the other hand, the United States is once again asserting its dominance, by forcing the O.A.S. which has always been its puppet, into a new stage of outright armed intervention. It has not only violated the sovereignty of the Dominican Republic, but undermined the very foundation of any Latin-American country's independence. All this must be stopped right here and now.

True inter-American solidarity must begin with the working people. Moreover, Dominica is, essentially, a Latin-American country in the hands of the people themselves. In Dominica there must be an immediate withdrawal of all U.S. and British forces, and the U.S. marines, but all the armed forces, whether wearing U.S. or British military uniforms.

THE JOHNSTON ADMINISTRATION

KANINGOFT "COMMUNISM"

Unfolding the history of the nationhood of Marxism as the theory of liberation that it is, is the only way to fight Communist ideology, which is a threat to humanity. Capitalist tyranny, exploiting eatery of U.S. imperialism; only the self-sufficiency of the people can achieve genuine independence that would not leave the American continent orbit. It is high time that the plundered continent regained its dignity, and that the United States withdraw its forces.

Since true freedom cannot be assured in any other way in either Dominica or Latin America, the United States, as long as it maintains relations with it, can never become a reality. It is that inter-American relations be established between the American states and the rebals.
Ramifications of the Watts Revolt

(Editors' Note: The column below is excerpted from a Perspectives Report delivered to a Conference of News & Letters Committee held over the Labor Day weekend. Copies of the entire report may be obtained for 50 cents by writing to News & Letters, 4242 Grand River, Detroit, Michigan.)

From all sides we are hearing a great deal these days about how "isolated" Watts was. What all the analysis fails to grasp is that the Negroes in Watts joined their struggle, not because they were isolated, but because they acted collectively. It was a disciplined strength. Thus, despite all talk against "Whitey" (and some hatred), not a single white who happened into the area was shot at, excluding, of course, the cops, but then these are the most hated representatives of the exploitative, prejudiced, vicious power structure.

CLASS AND RACE

No, it was not the Negro who was isolated; it was the white power structure that was isolated. And within the Negro population it was the middle class Negro, not the Negro mass, who stood isolated, even as it was the Negro leadership, who, precisely because they were outsiders, felt isolated.

There is good reason, however, to be suspicious of the word, "class," when it becomes very nearly a cliché in an outpouring of analysis by bourgeois ideologues. One is compelled to question the sudden embrace of "class" analysis. It certainly was not the result of a conversion to Marxism. The very opposite is the case. The sudden discovery of "class not race" as the basic cause of Negro self-sufficiency is only the latest manifestation of how the bourgeois always try to wear their own back in. When Karl Marx, after the Paris Commune, was confronted with the situation that every conceivable political tendency wanted to become part of the first Working Men's International Association, he wrote: "The old always tries to recognize itself in the new forms." And as it is with the present absence of the concept, "class.

The Watts revolt was certainly not a spontaneous class question. It was equally a race question. It will not do to try to separate what the actual events have welded together. It was not for purposes of releasing the creativity of the masses—organized on the lines of a real structure of society was suddenly "discovered." Rather, it was an administrative attempt to make the people who were in revolt forget what was new, to the self-discovery of their own creativity; the confidence in mass power; the differentiation from all others — the Negro middle class as well as the absent landlords, the absent grocery owner as well as the self-appointed but equally absent leaders.

NEW BEGINNINGS IN THEORY

"We don't belong to any organization. We meet in the street and talk. When it happens, we know what we want and we know what we would do about it. We'll start all over again if we don't get it." "We haven't lost a thing, and now we know where it hurts." "We'd do it all over again even if my own house burned alongside Whitey's store; my house was no good anyway." "We have the power to upset the city; break it wide open. We got the power." The revolt was both spontaneous and conscious of itself. Moreover, where, in the revolt in Harlem, which likewise was spontaneous (although not as thoroughly), Manhattans at least tried to claim credit, in Watts they were nowhere around. Nor were the Du Bois churls. Nor, for that matter, were the established civil rights organizations, although those, at least, showed after the event.

Yes, the revolt was a stride toward theory. It called one phase of activity and became a new one. The new stage is far more fundamental than a question of violence vs. non-violence as a method of struggle. The conscious war was not in the tactics of struggle but in the achievement of consciousness of self, of being able to make generalizations like "we know now where Whitey hurts" and that to take the first step in the construction of a society about a new society. But it is a first step only and, though a gigantic stride, it is not the end but a beginning. The point at issue now is and must be — what is next in activity, but what it must in thought. Without being able to make what philosophers call a category out of their experience, that is to say, to be able to confine it that it is not just an experience, but a stage in conclusion. In short, the experience itself will not become part of an emerging revolution either in its own or in its thought.

The experience otherwise can be taken over by others, by those who think to lead, or perhaps I should say, to "mislead," not because they "are bad men," but because they are not ready. And, as is pointed out, if the leadership is not ready, the workers are bound to substitute for the workers' reassertion of their historic experience, actions that have no relationship whatever to what the masses want, their quest for universality, i.e., to total freedom.

THE PEACE or LEADERSHIP?

No doubt the established Negro leadership who wants to assume its role and it too is moved by an ideology which may very well end in an apology for the status quo, but as long as the momentum of the struggle continues, the movement can easily replace this leadership. It is not only to bypass the "isolated" leaders, because they come out of the wake of one revolution and still use its language.

The overriding purpose of those who think to lead is to make sure that the masses are as much as the disposal of the "party" as the proletariat is at the disposal of capital.

Earlier I spoke of my opposition to amateur leaders. Let me add that I am an attitude that you are more than just those who make analysis of those leaders, I used the word, the "Party," etc. Why? This does not mean that all the good is black and all the bad is white. I know very well that of them who never belonged. But that is the situation. Whether one has a Party card, but whether one is firmly nailed by its dogma that the masses are backward and it is therefore necessary to lead the movement requires a prerogative of the leadership, in that way the intellects bring into whatever organization they belong to, the capitalist divisions between mental and manual labor.

Instead of this, what is the center of the movement is our right to real freedom, not in a distant tomorrow, but in an approaching today. Since it is an attitude that the movement against beingoten misunderstanding between theory and practice, and it is not only in demolishing the ideology of reconstructing society, it is this which motivated us, its ability to be in any way diverted from participation in the New Revolution, why we state in our Perspective:

Since the postwar politics, that is to say, very near half a century, nothing has happened to the American scene that can in any way compare with the Negro Revolution that began in Watts today the 1690 all-ins and has gained momentum ever since. This is the most important development not only for an American Revolution but for world developments since it touches both the basic relationship of a black and a white and it bears a direct and substantive relationship to the Afro-Asian Latin American world, therefore, to direct any way from the development is Marxist-speaking, criminal.
Editorial

China and the India-Pakistan War

Every gesture from President Johnson of the U.S. to Mao of China, from Khrushchev of Russia to Shastri of India, from Nasser of Egypt to Asad of Syria, from Kahlil of Pakistan to Gholam of Iran, and from the UN to the UN is trying to cover up the underlying struggle in Asia with ideological embellishments.

If you listen to President Johnson, you would believe that his harrowings acts in Vietnam are only ways to make Vietnam and North Vietnam as well as South Vietnam and the neutral part of the "neutral" Vietnam.

On the other hand, you would believe to China's broadcasts following the ultimatum to India to dismantle its border posts or suffer the consequences, you would think that the latest tension of the Indo-Pakistan war over Kashmir was the result of a "struggle for freedom" and not against Russian "aggression"?

Then, on Sept. 17, the New China News Agency asked out the following editorial:

"The Soviet leaders and the U.S. imperialism tried to use the India-Indonesia conflict as their darling child, and use today's Kennedy, Khrushchev and Nehru long ago for these purposes in a country. Some of the three founders of Nehru, Khrushchev and Nehru's friends, are dead and the third has fallen from power. Their successors are trying hard to keep the falling concerns going.

POWER IN ASIA

At the same time, Premier Khrushchev, who didn't yet inform the Russian people about his odious behavior in India, had invited both Shastri and Kahlil to come to Russia and discuss "peaceful coexistence" which is supposed to solve all problems left unsolved both by hot and cold war.

As for Shastri, he has become as old in fashioning a winged phrase as any ruler, East or West, and it is thus in the name of "defense against fascism" that he is depriving the people of Kashmir of their right to self-determination.

Not to be outdone, Ayub Kahlil is playing the game of being on all sides at the same time, from "American assistance" to "Chinese assistance"; whether in collusion with China or not, he is allegedly engaging in a war with India only for the latter's "glory" or "India cannot be a great power in Asia without Pakistan." (See "Our Life and Times," p. 64)

Power in Asia is the question. Whether you take Vietnam or Korea as the signpost of departure, it is the richer of the continent, and not the ideologies used to justify war, that are at stake. The so-called "cold war" is a struggle to impose the deep peoples that the glory of privy and/or state capital, and not to liberate them when the right of freedom is in question.

The Indo-Pakistan war over Kashmir is yet one more reminder that the national movements like the war for World War II itself, did not end with the temporary solution problem of reconstituting society on non-exploitative foundations.

The only thing that is new in China's long-outdated thrust to include this country by its own invasions into Indian territory is the rare with which it makes sure not to attack the real world powers—United States. Even since the Korean wars, India has more often than not backed off from a direct confrontation with the United States, be that over Quemoy and Orange Islands or Vietnam and India.

MAO GLORIFIES WAR

In his attempt to reduce social revolution to military conquest, Mao has found his Minister of Defense, Marshal Liu Bo, to transform his military theory of instilling the people into a universally applicable strategy concept: "Taking the entire globe, if North America and Western Europe can be considered the heart of the world, then Asia, Africa, and Latin America constitute the rural areas of the world." Everything is dispositional. And in this colonized China, anything can be set up and destroyed. The people of Asia, Africa, Latin America and other reclass can destroy it just by voicing some striking at its head and others at its feet. War can temper the people and push history forward.

Underlying the hallucination of "revolutionizing" the United States as well as the eagerness to help "war push history forward" is Mao's total lack of understanding of the proletarian revolution. "Since World War II the proletarian revolutionary movement has developed in various regions and has played a very important role in both the American and West European capitalist countries, while the people's revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America has been growing vigorously. In a sense, the contemporary world revolution presents a picture of the reconstitution of cities by the rural areas in the concept of "people's revolution," which includes "the national bourgeoisie and other patriotic and anti-imperialist democrats." Considering the vogue of the proletarian revolution in state-capitalist societies calling themselves "Communists," beginning shortly after the death of Stalin, with the June 17, 1955 East German revolt, through the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, the "revolutions and trouble-making incidents" within China itself, it is no wonder Mao prefers dealing with such stirring democrats as the King of Nepal and General Ayub Kahlil of Pakistan and the lesser "patriots." (Some one ought to tell him that the "Negro people's revolution" in America is 90 per cent working class in composition.)

Where Mao's eyes are gled on the United States, they are on Russia. And as we now know that it is evidently not the who is interested just now in India, but that the "Khrushchev revisionists" have come to the rescue of U.S. imperialism just when it is most panic-stricken and helpless in its efforts to cope with people's war. They submit to the nuclear blackmail of the U.S. imperialists... and have found dreams of Soviet-U.S. cooperation to dominate the world... in diametrical opposition to the Khrushchev revisionists, the revolutionary people never take a gleamings of war.

WARS AND REVOLUTIONS ARE NOT SYNONYMOUS

Socialist theory understanding wars and revolutions are not synonymous. They are oppositions. Wars are the natural outcome of exploitative social orders and only prove that state-capitalism is in crisis. The conflicts between the people and the oppressors of their lives is in a war with the U.S. in China, the world war is a war with people's war.

On the other hand, the social revolution tears the old exploitative order out, root and branch. Thus the idea of freedom and the struggle for it become indivisible. Such a way of life, and only such a way of life, has no use for wars to insecure revolution's victory, and put destiny in the hands of the working people themselves."

Aug. Sept. '65
REVOLT IN INDONESIA: WHAT NEXT IN ASIA?

By Hays Burley

So anxious was the English press to present the Oct. 1 Army counter-coup in Indonesia not only as an anti-Communist victory, but as a victory for the West that the Daily London Times hurried to declare that President Sukarno had "denied to be a factor in the Indonesian political scene." This, despite the fact that both Lieutenant General Hatta, who replaced the Sept. 30 coup as well as General Nasution, who led the counter-coup, fell simultaneously, on Dec. 1, 1955, that they were not only "well," but "carying out leadership of the state and government.

The simple fact is that Commercial Indonesia was at that very moment celebrating the 25th anniversary of its coming to power, and Allied was in Peking getting the red carpet treatment accorded by all those against "Westernization." While this does not necessarily absolve the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI) of its guilt, the more important event is that the PKI, having been removed in the events of the past decade, and especially as far as the West is concerned, has been reduced to the point of being a fringe element in the political scene. This is not to say that the PKI is no longer a force, but rather that its influence has been greatly diminished.

In view of the fact that the Socialist Party has long been banned, and that this month Sukarno with the support of the PKI, has also banned the George (Protestant) Party, it seems clear that the Communist and Sukharni di vision is the main threat to the political scene. If Sukarno does not give in to the demands of the PKI, he may be forced to give in to the demands of the Western powers. Sukarno has already shown that he is willing to give in to the demands of the West, but he will have to do so on his own terms.

The latest reports say that General Hatta, who has been in charge of the situation since the Oct. 1 coup, has been given full power by Sukarno. This is a sign that Sukarno is confident that he can handle the situation without outside intervention. It is also a sign that Sukarno is willing to give in to the demands of the West, but only on his own terms.

In conclusion, it seems clear that Sukarno is the man to watch in Indonesia. He has shown that he is willing to give in to the demands of the West, but only on his own terms. He has also shown that he is willing to give in to the demands of the PKI, but only on his own terms. It is clear that Sukarno is the man to watch in Indonesia, and that his actions will determine the future of the country.
pling to our own characteristics, let us cling to the only right standpoint for guided democracy, namely, no voting.

In 1945, he searched Parliament, rejected the early and more vague Constitution of 1945, and declared himself President, Prime Minister, Commander-in-Chief, Great Leader of Revolution, not to mention also "Chief Pharmacist." Nevertheless, on the whole, during the 1950s he considered himself a Realist, and though he leaned heavily on the "fist," he also tried to support the "fist" with a "Hamlet," especially as General Suharto, who, in putting down the army revolt of 1958, showed that he was more than just a Realist and a Communist. In any case, Sukarno knew how to use both the Army and the PSI.

What he didn't know how to do, or more correctly, didn't want to do, was deepen the revolution within Indonesia, set up a viable relationship with the masses in his own country who had won independence from Dutch imperialism, but found little enough freedom and stability in their own lives. He believed his regime was a state of bourgeois and semi-bourgeois nature that was becoming as repressive as any other military force, although its origins were in guerrilla warfare for the freedom of their country. And the National Plan didn't add the appropriate social conditions either in the countryside or in the cities. In the 1960s, Sukarno embarked on a most ambitious foreign policy.

SUKARNO THE "REALIST"

With characteristic gall, Sukarno moved against Socialists, Trotskyites, Marxists as if he were doing so from the left in the name of "communism instead of false Communism." Thus, on May 23 of this year, at the PSI's 60th anniversary rally, here is how he explained his original in- tention of NAKASOM (not stand for nationalism, and so for Communists): "Some Indonesian are asked me why did IKG (then PSI) not use the word "masses" or "mass" but used the word "people." The reason was the word "people" which is often unavailably used by political anarchists and political opportunists is the word "mass." The same situation is in Indonesia, brothers and sisters, you all know the banned Indonesian Socialist Party. I say that they are not Marxists, they are usurpers of Marxism. Therefore, I do not use the word "masses," ... they are in fact counter-revolutionaries ... oust the real revolutionaries ... I reject once more, "mass." Yes, genuine Communism and not false Communism.

Duttagi would, no doubt, be a more precise word than "masses" to describe the eclectic Sukarno. The point is that the masses in his own country, no matter how aroused to "crush Malaysia," were more concerned with labor conditions in their own countries, with their lives. 16 years after independence, this formerly rice-surplus area had to import rice. It was short on foodstuffs. There was little industry, in many respects less than before independence when you consider the decline in oil, and the near standstill in tax and rubber. And in the countryside, where the overwhelming majority of Indonesian live, there was little enough of "masjagwar" and "masulat" (communal deliberate and destitute), but a great deal of plain old exploitation. The class divisions, moreover, were not only native, but also "foreign"; the Chinese landlords and merchants still play their old roles. The peasants and students and youth who rioted during China's visit saw this, just this, and not any "imanatement revolution." In the words of the Chinese,

All in all, 1962 was a very bad year for Sukarno. Not only had his "crush Malaysia" campaign failed, but his last hope, the coup, was "by the time the con's crowns on January 1, 1963," was simply ludicrous.

Although Sukarno's Jan. 1 speech, "Quiet the UPR," was high- ly acclaimed in Mao's China as a revolutionary act which resonated throughout the world as the first spring thunder of 1962, and none of the three Asian nations followed that "spring thunder." The African nations had their experience with the "Chinese revolutionary thunder," and our "Chinese revolution" was in a most unanimously based on genuine Maoist overthrow of Ben Bella. And so, while many did consider Malaysia a symbol of neo-colonialism, they failed to see the carnage of any possible Indonesia-Chinese alliance as the answer to the world crisis.
Indonesian Communism: A Case of World Communism's Decomposition

It is impossible at this moment (Oct. 5) to know whether the coup on Sept. 30, and the necessary coup on Oct. 1, were manifestations of nothing more than divisions within the armed forces in Indonesia, or were indicative of class divisions within the population. There is no doubt that the regime is trying to explain away the coup by blaming it on the army's reaction to the government that, in the 16 years of independence, has failed to make any significant progress in the prevailing poverty, or to achieve basic land reform, or to generally improve the living conditions of the masses. New has there been any serious industrialization, much less any radical change in the conditions of labor.

The fact that both the rebels and the regular armed forces stressed that President Sukarno is "well" shows how non-revolutionary the attempted coup was. Whether or not the Communists were involved in it, it is they whom the masses will rightly blame for the failure to distinguish between the Communists and the masses, ever since the 1959 coup. It is true that the masses are now ready for a new wave of revolution, but the Communists have not been able to mobilize the masses effectively.

The PKI (Indonesian Communist Party) is the proof that (1) when it comes to destroying state power at all costs, there is not only no fundamental difference between the "revolutionaries" and the "reactionaries"; and (2) the PKI's leadership is corrupt, inefficient, and incapable of solving the problems of the masses. The PKI's leadership is still committed to the Russian model of "revolutionary" politics, which has failed to deliver the promised results.

The PKI's leadership is not only incompetent, but also corrupt. They have failed to provide the masses with an alternative to the ruling class, and instead have fueled the very problems that they claim to be fighting against.

In conclusion, the PKI's leadership is not only incompetent, but also corrupt. They have failed to provide the masses with an alternative to the ruling class, and instead have fueled the very problems that they claim to be fighting against.
With his concept of the "cloc of four classes," Stalin helped kill the U.S.-Sino revolutionary mood, too, never to be revived again. Now, as much about Kuala Lumpur, took up the Stalinist legacy, adding a new dimension to his view: that the only way to achieve a lasting peace is through the destruction of all bourgeois institutions. In particular, he argued that the only way to achieve a lasting peace is through the destruction of all bourgeois institutions.

This is a radical view, but one that was not completely without its followers. Many in Indonesia, for example, saw it as a way to achieve their goals. The latter, however, led to the destruction of all bourgeois institutions, including the paper industry itself.

Adloff's "original" paper was not, however, without its critics. Some felt that it was too radical and that it would lead to a complete destruction of all institutions. Others felt that it was too moderate and that it would not achieve its goals.


table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Adloff's &quot;original&quot; paper was published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Stalin's death marked the end of the period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the immediate post-war period in Europe when the Communist Parties in Russia had become mass parties, the saying was that all Stalin had to do to get power was to raise his telephone and give the proper order. Only he never picked up that telephone because, while he wanted power, "he was ruled by a complex and powerful system of power in the streets, power he could not control with his "Red Army," power that was "outside of Stalin's rule." The masses themselves, whether, for example, Mao or Stalin, could not be trusted until his "Red Army" was ready and the Communist Party led them, preferably with Stalin's aid, but in no case should it be simply the Communists working with the masses themselves.

The result has been precisely that which it was in Western Europe: capitalism has taken the wind out of the Communist Party's sails, and the Communist Party has been forced to adopt a more moderate and conciliatory stance. This is especially true in the case of China, where the Communist Party has been forced to adopt a more moderate and conciliatory stance. This is especially true in the case of China, where the Communist Party has been forced to adopt a more moderate and conciliatory stance.

FOOTNOTES

(1) Fundamentally, of course, there is nothing whatever in common between the Communist Party founded in 1920 (under the leadership of the Russian Revolution of 1917, and the war that followed) and the German Communist Party. The latter, however, is a group of intellectuals who, for a variety of reasons, decided to support the Communist Party.

(2) "Internally Revolutionary Offensive and First Opposite "Fascist Criminals"" appears in Peking Review, June 4, 1955, which was printed in Peking's speech as well as notes from President Sukarno's address, "Indonesian C.P. is a Thoroughly Progressive, Revolutionary Party."

(3) The Maliks, one of the early founders of the PFI, looks back in this issue of the PFL. He writes: "We attached great importance to the work of the PFI, which was really a new party in Indonesia, building a new revolutionary party. It was in this that we saw our mission."

(4) NAKAROK, "the popular front" now refers to the cooperation of all "masses" (nationalists, workers, peasants) against the "counter-revolutionary" movement. Sukarno has done away with parliament, declaring "all parties have to be included in the new cabinet."

(5) In the full epoch, New Year's 1904, Adloff evidently was concerned about the "unrest of revolutionaries" who hold that "all good communists cannot possibly exist without a strong proletariat as its basis." He referred to the fact that the proletariat is the "basis of revolutionaries," but that the masses are "not" revolutionaries. The" popular front" actually operates independently on Sukarno and those who choose to exclude it from the "inner cabinet."


(7) The confused story of that period has to be told by Sukarno himself later as presented in his "Autobiography" and "Memoirs." He then recommended the establishment of a "popular front" to the Indonesian government. See Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia by George McR. Kahin. It is most remarkably written about the subject and has the advantage also of being an eye-witness report for the period 1940-45 period. The work was published in 1952, and should therefore be supplemented by A. S. T. Sukarno, "The Roots of Indonesian Socialism," by James E. Mita. Neither work deals with theory in a serious way and must therefore be supplemented by "The Challenge of Mao Tse-Tung" in Marxism and Freedom.
Why Philosophy? Why Now?

Twenty years after the end of World War II—a full generation has grown up who had not yet been born at the outbreak of that conflict. This generation was born while the Great Depression was still in effect, they lived through the Second World War, and they now dominate the political and economic scene. The postwar generation has grown up in a world of abundance and plenty, a world of technological marvels, a world of mass production and mass consumption. They are the generation that has experienced the rise of the United States as a world superpower, the growth of the technology industry, and the spread of global capitalism.

In the United States, the generation that grew up after World War II is often referred to as the Baby Boomers. This generation has had a significant impact on American culture and politics. They are known for their focus on education and personal achievement, and they have been influential in the areas of social justice and civil rights.

In short, the postwar generation has grown up in a world of abundance and plenty, a world of technological marvels, a world of mass production and mass consumption. They are the generation that has experienced the rise of the United States as a world superpower, the growth of the technology industry, and the spread of global capitalism.
(cont'd)

of the old but the creation and continuity of the new, will determine the structure of a new book.

No one else has ever passed the working out of a new relationship of theory to practice demanded by our age. The reestablishment of the Humanist and Abolitionist roots of Marxism, which were the goals of Marxism and Freedom—and which were concretized on the American scene by America Civilization on Trial, as in the new edition of Marxism and Freedom—must be extended so that both organizationally and philosophically the numerous movements on a world scale can rediscover the missing link, the historic continuity with the freedom struggle and more and for all have freedom be, individually, socially, totally.

From "Silent Dialogue," July 1968
"The Twenty Years"

6761
The Humanism of Mars Is the Basic Foundation for Anti-Stalinism Today

(As a contribution to the developing discussion on anti-Stalinism, the following article was submitted to Trotsky’s Workers newspapers by the author during her recent lecture tour of Japan.)

The death of Stalin, in March, 1953, marked the end of an era. De-Stalinization began almost at once, not by Khrushchev from above, but by the East bloc workers from below. On June 17, 1953, there was spontaneous revolt for “peace and freedom” and against capitalist-type rules and political repression. These first stirrings followed the Khrushchev speech in the United Nations General Assembly, broadcast to the world on January 17, 1953, formally embarked on de-Stalinization. It brought to the surface the growing dissatisfaction with Stalin’s regime.

Thus did the Russian-Chinese counter-revolution begin and, hand in hand with it, came the campaign of slander against the Hungarian revolutionaries as “revisionists.” However, because the revolutionary creative realization of Marxism for our age came from an elemental social force, and because the Hungarian workers had also been active in the Latin America, in Africa, in the whole new third world fighting for freedom from Western imperialism as well, it was impossible to stifle and to contain the Hungarian Example to submarine library shelves.

It is true that when the young workers left the manuscripts to the storming columns of the press, it failed to achieve the true triumph over the world. But the living Marx kept controlling and developing its concept of alienation as it developed into the proletariat’s open forum, as an Instrument of an independent theory of revolution, the Path of Communism, or that of the revolutionary class, as activist, and new Secretariat with the year, 1966, “The Lenin’s Independent Philosophical Breakthrough”
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Basis for a New Revolutionary International

There must be no more Hiroshimas and Nagazakis. And something a great deal less horrifying than a 'degenerated worker' should be reserved for retrogressivists, for any who espouse the barbarous view that a 'new civilization' can be built on the ruins of what would be left of the world after a thermonuclear war. (7) In a nuclear age where the only war that can be won is the battle for the minds of men, it is high time for Marxists and other freedom fighters to clear their heads, and, in state-capitalism that calls itself Communism, East and West, unfurl the new historic banner of the new revolutionary Marxist International.

Tokyo, Dec. 23, 1965
Raya Dunayskaya

(3) See especially Emre Noy on Communism and Tito Deary's writings as well as Pe Prolet for the whole year, 1966.
(4) Fidel Castro, History Will Absolve Me
(5) See both Leopold Oddar Ruhmer, Africa's Socialism, and Sekou Touré, Africa's Path in History
(7) For a more detailed analysis of Mao's position on thermonuclear war, see the chapter, "The Challenge of San Tai-lun" in MARXISM AND FREEDOM.
French Elections Intensify NATO Disarray

The American bourgeois press was all too eager to gloss over the recent setback to De Gaulle. By the time the popular opposition to De Gaulle was evident, it seemed that the General would have to undergo a run-off election, a replay of the 1962 elections. The media might have been led to believe that France was now solidly behind De Gaulle's "foreign policy, especially his opposition to NATO."

The truth was that by the time French protests were mounting, they were not against the war in Algeria, but against De Gaulle's anti-Americanism, his internal policy of keeping wages down, as well as agricultural policies which had led to recession in the country. As his second trip to Russia shows, the General will continue with his attacks on NATO.

Following what has now become his annual custom, De Gaulle has once again deliberately challenged U.S. nuclear diplomacy in his pursuit of French grandeur, or Europe on the Gaullist plan.

By threatening to kick over the NATO house of cards, he has once again forced the U.S. to back down on the declared opposition to De Gaulle's "force de frappe" (nuclear striking force) and actually help him develop it.

By threatening to pull out of the Atlantic Alliance, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg have been driven down on their knees demanding economic and political support from them.

His only opposition so far has been the resistance of the French working class. His methods are the traditionally fascist officers' corps of the French army, as well as himself. But they also involve Gaullist-inspired Communists and some of the most recently diverted, immobilized and suppressed this massive delivery to his totalitarian ambitions. It is especially interesting to note that De Gaulle finds his allies among old, established and essential workers and the nationalized state, which is the open state-capitalist-enterprise of the French economy.

By early on, with the support of virtually the entire mass population of France, two million workers were on the verge of a general strike. If he had never forgone, they would have never forgotten.

* In January 1964 - De Gaulle recognized Mao's China to the outside at the U.S. billion dollars worth of steel and French wheat which its own market partners were forced to pay a $40 million subsidy.

Having shown what he could do within the NATO Alliance, he cast his visionary eye upon the alliance for progress with an autumn tour of Latin America. He was anything but a triumph. Being a man of all seasons, however, he followed up with this year's announcement that in 1967 he will leave his negotiator seat at the Algerian Sahara in France Guinea on the northern coast of South America. Some 2,500 miles southwest of Florida, Cape de Garde will be about 3,500 miles closer to Cape Kennedy than to Paris.

Though Washington strategists may wince at De Gaulle's "force de frappe" for having only a 3-megaton capacity compared with the multi-thousand megaton U.S. has deployed in West Germany, these three meagretons were powerful enough to scuttle the multitudes of Force in NATO and win major concessions from the White House at the very time that he was fighting for a reappraisal of the dependence with the Kremlin.

So great are the NATO rifts that three years before its official termination in 1969, it is in fact in tatters, certainly tottering.

It was a kind of victory from the start. Created in 1949 under the impact of Stalin's seizure of Czechoslovakia, based on the state-capitalist reconstruction of the nations, the anti-communist organization, based upon America's awe-inspiring nuclear monopoly— which ended only a month later when Stalin exploded his first A-bomb. From the reviving old fashioned nationalism, De Gaulle has successfully revived old fashioned imperialism plunder with the ostensible new feature of anti-colonial state planning supported by nuclear power. His Four Year Plans since coming to power in 1958 clearly show this.

It is this which the French masses are rejecting.

This renewal of working class strength is in January 1964 — with a "third force" for a new unified Europe. It is the only reasonable, democratic, creative force not only for human survival but for humanitarian revolution and the lasting reconstruction of a free world forever free from tension, torment and tyranny.
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LBJ-Ky 'Summit' A Combination of Jingoism and Hypocrisy

President Johnson went to Honolulu to devise new more forceful methods of getting the Vietcong to come to terms with the United States. Just as President Johnson had ordered a temporary cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam so as to facilitate negotiations of some sort, so he would allow himself in a new, revised stage of negotiations, and just as he then resumed bombing of the North while unsettling the U.S. to bring the warring parties to the "negotiating table," so he now thinks he can assist his puppet with a soothing interest in "agricultural reform."

Our double-tongued, Jason-faced Communist Chief defies only himself if he thinks anyone will take seriously his pompous statements about building "a new society" when the acts he approves result in a searched earth policy of SOUTH VIETNAM, spraying poison on the rice fields, putting their homes in the torch, killing civilians.

COMMITTMENT TO WHAT?

We are now face to face not only with the escalation of the war in Vietnam, South and North, but with its expansion into other Southeast Asian lands, whose ramifications might very well set off World War III. It is high time therefore to take a comprehensive look at what America is "committed" to.

The fateful word in the lexicon of Secretary of State Dean Rusk is "commitment." Even those in the U.S. Senate who oppose the Vietnam war are nevertheless allowing the Johnson Administration to go unscathed with the implication that "commitment" refers to the 1966 Senate Resolution which authorized the President to take "all necessary steps" to stop the aggression "symptoms" in the Gulf of Tonkin Incident. Thus, the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, J. William Fulbright, though he is conducting public hearings into U.S. conduct in the Vietnam war, says he is "not at all part of the part of the part he played in getting that resolution passed — as if a change in that resolution would get us out of the war. He wonders "the great dictator" is turning out to be an exposé, not of what Sen. Morse calls "the illegal war," but only of the common ground from which both the "divers" and the "isolationists" concluded in their combat against the "Defenders of American capitalism, its commitment to neo-colonialism.

The year of that commitment was 1964, but 1954. The commitment was not to "other", but to U.S. imperialism's new role of "colonialism in expedition" which was responsible for creating new forms of colonialism, Thus, although General MacArthur's plan for a "corridors" of free evacuation areas had been contained, John Foster Dulles' theory of the "containment of communism" was given full reign. He walked out of the Geneva Conference and created SEATO. Threats of "colonial evacuation" were repeated over and over in the world's mirror without humility, and the refusal to sign the Geneva Accord which ended the French colonial war in Indochina and replaced the "his Minh" with the "Son Dinh Dien" as the man to talk to.

What the commitment to neo-colonialism did not count on was that the author of this semi-sneak, corrupt, exploitative regime of the Bien family would succeed in creating what his Chief Minister could not create — a genuine grass roots mass opposition to Dien's rule. Vietnam, no less than a million man run from North Vietnam, its "totalitarianism," in 1954, Dien's terror against any and all organizations very nearly united the Vietnamese population, to a man, in a fight against his tyrannical rule.

It was only then that the Vietcong won the countryside. It was only then that the underground Communist movement to South Vietnam finally succeeded in getting Dien to come to its assistance. Dien's weakness was known to be heard more sympathetically than Khrushchev's Russia in Europe.

Ten military coups and 18 months after Dien's overthrow has brought no fundamental changes to South Vietnam, while U.S. "commitment" has become so total that it is popping up the latest military units with the lives of 200,000 American troops

OPPOSITION IN AND OUT OF CONGRESS

Congressional opposition to this alliance committed to neo-colonialism is important only from the point of view that it reflects a much more fundamental anti-war position on the part of the American people. The voice of this vast majority is, however, not heard in the decision makers in which the millions upon millions it expressed its opposition to Coldwater and its proposals for escalating the Vietnam War. The question is why? Why does the radical anti-war opposition appear to be so isolated from this "rest majority."

It would be short sighted indeed if, for the sake of appearances of unity in anti-war positions, we failed to reveal the only principled stand, and which was not only a barrier against war but for a totally new world order which alone could win the struggle for the minds of men, without which no anti-war position can succeed in actually staying the hand of the Imperialists who have their hands on the nuclear triggers, West and East.

To do otherwise would be to continue isolation from those who do not join the anti-war struggle because they think that the type of opposition to U.S. policy they have means favoring the Russians or China. Let the people of Vietnam, South and North, decide their own fate. At a time when Cesar is compelled to say that Mao's China uses "methods and procedures" that are "absolutely the same as the ones used by the United States ... in frank violation of the sovereignty of our country," it becomes imperative to take a second look at all aspects of the anti-Vietnam war struggles. It is high time for LaRaza to do all they can to see that the struggle against Vietnam imperialism doesn't become a trap for favoring Chinese or Russian state-capitalism which likewise opposes the Vietnam war for their own reasons.

Nothing could stand in the way of fighting Johnson and Ky's "peremptory" to speak "for" the people of South Vietnam. But neither do Brondes nor Han. Let the people speak for themselves. Only they can define that somber Hitler. Vice-President Humphrey may have/khé Ky's "partner in social progress," but the Vietnamese people know the semi-social exploitation which has made them farm the Vietcong. Let us therefore turn the calendar back to the day the Vietnamese, as a united land, defended their French overlords.

HANOI AND THE RUSSIA-CHINA BLOC. THE DAY AFTER THE VIETNAM DEFENDED FRENCH IMPERIALISM AT Hanoi Bien Pho, it was pressured by its two "soviets allies," Russia and China, to go to Geneva—and lose of the negotiating table what it had won on the battlefield—until Vietnam, Post-Slava Russia had, the previous year, hurried to conclude the Korean War, and now hurried for "peaceful co-existence" in order to have time to solve the crisis in China and Vietnam. It was anxious to turn its attention to industrialization, undeterred by wars not only with the U.S. but the presence of the U.S. in the Red River Delta.

In 1964 the Sino-Soviet conflict was nowhere on the horizon. The Sino-Soviet revolutionary unity was still on firm, in the battle against the U.S. imperialism. China, and when it did finally align itself with Peking, it did not give up all its freedom of movement nor recognize Russian aid. The struggle against the U.S., neo-colonialist role in Vietnam must not get bogged down in the type of talks opposition alone does in the U.S. Today, it is not in the trap of being for any other ruthless bloc which opposes U.S. imperialism only in order itself to dominate the world.

WHAT NEXT?

Thought, too, is an event. To unfold a banner of freedom, to discard a vision of a world an truly classless, human foundation is the only way to win the struggle for the minds of men. This is so in the U.S. where the opposition to U.S. imperialism's war in Vietnam can develop into a mass movement only when we stop using the "immediate struggle" from the "ultimate" aim of total freedom. And it is so on the battlefield of Vietnam where freedom cannot be won without an underlying philosophy of freedom.
Where these two inseparables are separated, as they were in 1954 and thereafter, the battle was not simply a new social order, not only because it was lost at the negotiating table, but above all, because North Vietnam didn't practice freedom the day after the battle was won. This was evident not only "the day after" when there was a mass exodus from North Vietnam, but again in 1967 in the country when both small farmers and intellectuals revolted as ruthlessly as in China.

The struggle for freedom in South Vietnam arose from below, and independent of any aid, in theory as well as in fact, from North Vietnam. Where it fills it now, as it should, it must be allowed to decide "for" the liberation movement in the South. Only the South Vietnamese themselves must have the right to decide their own fate. It is toward that end that the anti-Vietnam war struggles in the United States, and the world over, must be directed.
Early Marxist-Humanist Analysis of Viet Nam's Predicted War Moves

(Editor's Note: A reader from Boston writes, "I have just been reading some of Baba Dong Nguyen's POLITICAL LETTERS, and found it quite interesting. I wonder if you could provide some analysis of the Marxian-Humanist method of analyzing."

We print below the text of that letter written by our Boston correspondent.

October 9, 1961

St. Louis, Missouri

Dear Editor:

I was just reading an article in the New York Times about the situation in Vietnam. It seems that the United States is increasing its military involvement there. I wonder if you could provide some analysis of this situation using the Marxian-Humanist method.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

The Theory of the Permanent Revolution

The West has shown no signs of permanently recognizing the reality of the situation in Vietnam. The United States, for example, has increased its military presence in Vietnam, but has failed to recognize the need for a permanent solution to the conflict.

Viet Nam is a country that has been under French colonial rule since the early 20th century. The French colonialists were able to maintain their rule in Vietnam by exploiting the country's natural resources and suppressing the local population. However, the French were unable to quell the growing anti-colonial movement in Vietnam.

The Viet Minh, a communist-led nationalist movement, emerged in the late 1940s. They fought against the French for independence and eventually succeeded in gaining control of much of Vietnam.

The United States became involved in Vietnam in the 1960s, as it sought to prevent the spread of communism in Southeast Asia. The United States increased its military presence in Vietnam, and eventually became embroiled in a civil war.

In conclusion, the United States' involvement in Vietnam has been a failure. It has failed to recognize the need for a permanent solution to the conflict, and has instead continued to escalate the war, with tragic consequences.

Continued on page 7

Viet Nam: Nationalism, Communism, and America's Asian Strategy.

In Vietnam, the United States' involvement in the war was marked by a lack of strategy. The United States sought to maintain its influence in Vietnam by supporting the South Vietnamese government, which was seen as an ally in the global Cold War.

The United States' strategy in Vietnam was based on the belief that the South Vietnamese government was capable of defending itself against the communist-led North Vietnamese. However, this belief was soon proven false, as the South Vietnamese government was unable to hold back the communist advance.

In conclusion, the United States' involvement in Vietnam was a failure. It failed to recognize the need for a permanent solution to the conflict, and instead continued to escalate the war, with tragic consequences.
(cont'd)

this point of history reveals the new and dramatic test that may be so vital to the whole 20th Century struggle for the soul of man. All I know is that what is abstract in Marx's in the Absolute Idea, like "Self-determination in which alone the idea is to hear itself speak," was made concrete in Lenin's time by the speech of the Irish Revolution which Lenin immediately embraced as not just "ordinary principle of self-determination of nations" but as the "fossil of socialist revolution." Can we try to be that daring and bold in the philosophical approach needed in our day?...

THE DESIRE FOR WORLD DOMINATION

The rightist coup in Laos in 1968 was followed by the Leftist Pathet Lao coup in 1969. Supposedly peace and "nationalism" has now been established—only to have the Kennedy Administration announce that the U.S. "would not permit Laos to be used as a Communist military base against South Viet Nam." (C.N.Y. Times, October 8, 1969) As I stated above, it is not "the foreigner," the outside that makes the downfall of South Viet Nam inevitable—it is the internal, the rejection by the masses of the corrupt, unstable government of South Viet Nam. Just as it was important to show the nature in the theory of permanent revolution to explain the mass base in the few places Trotskyism has one in the underdeveloped countries, so it now becomes imperative to clarify the distinction between U.S. monopoly capitalism with state overstates and Russian state-capitalism with "national" overstates. Both are cut for single world domination, it is true. Both are part of the world stage of capitalist development—state capitalism—is equally true.

Nevertheless, the Russian (and Chinese) society wish to remake the world in their own image and that is their own image and therefore open up for the intelligentsia the role of being the new ruling class while the American private capitalism is busy enough to want to dominate by pure identification with the old ruling class and mass open as visits to any section of the population that would gain from the overthrow of the status quo.

It is this which makes Kennedy resort back to the mailed fist, the old Eisenhower-Dulles policy variant of it: whether it is West Germany and the re-establishment of the Kepes that gave birth to Nazism, or it is South Viet Nam and the re-establishment of the rule of the mandarins. In this way the young bright intellectuals around Kennedy express their total bankruptcy. In less than a year of rule we face the panic commented of U.S. troops in Southeast Asia. But the American people are not about to consent to another Korea, nor to another brainwashing, whether it comes from the fall state-capitalists, or there only on the road to state-capitalism. What we as a group need to do while this still is in the discussion stage, and the State Department is still busy denying it means actual combat duty is to show that no event, no matter how minor, can be analyzed, or acted upon, except as a totality of philosophical, economic, political and organizational outlook such as Marxist.

January 1969
ARE THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA HEADED TOWARD WAR?

By B. D. Susovsky, Chairman, National Editorial Board

The labour unions of South Vietnam gave the anti-American struggle there an altogether new quality by the May 1st march on the U.S. Embassy in Saigon. In China, on the other hand, Premier Chou En-lai's welcome to the Albanian delegation was distinguished, not by its attack on U.S. imperialism, but by the virulence directed against Russia. Thus we see that just as the United States' imperial designs in Vietnam blind it to any respect of the Sino-Soviet conflict rather than that it allegedly gives the U.S. a "free hand" in its barbarous war, so Mao's China ignores all world crises, including the Vietnam war, to its own conflict with Russia.

Neither source exists any illumination on the true state of the Vietnam war, much less whether it is leading to a war of the United States with China, or with Russia, or both — or a war of China against Russia. To discern the contradictory statements and the contradictory actions, we need to discern the global scene of each.

"COMMUNIST INFILTRATION"

The White House, the Pentagon, the State Department — all have an easy answer to everything happening in Vietnam: "Communist infiltration." The Buddhists offer, in their weeklong demonstrations against that policy of Hilter and protégé of President Johnson, General Ky, was "Communist infiltrated."

The Buddhists call off the demonstrations, but university students continued with their demonstrations; they were "Communist infiltrated."

The Buddhists yank the anti-war march against infiltrators and for an end to the war, too, "of course," "Communist infiltrated."

Nonetheless, Wall Street is perturbed. Is it not the change in the world, and the discipline now-exerted by the Buddhist leaders, America's boundless ambition, in destroy where it cannot dominate, would have led to that same tragedy being played out to its bitter end?

On the matter of the Buddhists, too, Ky and the Americans are hopelessly in the dark. Ky and the Americans read some of the Buddhist leaders as "Communist infiltrated" without csviding such truths as the fact that the Buddhists here in Saigon are no greater a threat to the U.S. than the Buddhists in Vietnam — the "Buddhists who may favor neutrality" for Vietnam, or the Chinese who are all too eager to continue the war in the Vietnam war.

The Buddhists are, indeed, the only argument for non-invasion of the Vietnamese people, the shock of the world, and the discipline now-exerted by the Buddhist leaders.

"THE BUDDHISTS"

The real question to be asked of the Buddhists in: why had he ordered the demonstration stopped just when the masses displayed such strength that they both contributed to the success of the demonstrations? Did he agree to elections and a civilian government and brought to a halt the awesome military might of the U.S.?

THAT SAWUH VIETNAM GENERAL KY

In truth, it was America's military project, General Ky, and not "Communist infiltration," which very nearly resulted in genocide of a nation by its own military clique. It was Ky who was bent on repressing the heroic people when Lenin, in his own savage fashion, declared: "I would destroy, even if it were to see another smoke from the bombs of the North Vietnamese army, to liberate from the Communists." Ky's way of destroying that he was not only the power behind the throne, but the front man himself, was to substitute for "slapping hands," the order that commissar be flown to Danang, "an liberation" it from "Communist infiltration."

The American military obliged by transporting these smoke throwers to the city that does not rest in America's latest project. And it is not for the sake of the Vietnamese people, the shock of the world, and the disciplined non-intervention of the Buddhists that Thich Tri Quang, as "a red in yellow."
The consensus among those who have watched the Vietnam war for years is that it has reached a point where the United States can no longer afford to continue fighting it. The war has cost the lives of thousands of Americans and has sapped the strength of the American people. The cost of the war is now estimated at several billion dollars, and it is clear that the United States cannot afford to continue fighting it.

China has also been a major player in the Vietnam war. The Chinese government has provided economic aid and military support to the Vietnamese government, and Chinese soldiers have fought alongside Vietnamese soldiers in the battlefields of Vietnam. The Chinese government has also expressed strong support for the Vietnamese people in their struggle for national independence.

The United States and China have been engaged in a struggle for global influence, and the Vietnam war has been a key factor in this struggle. The United States has sought to maintain its influence in Southeast Asia, while China has sought to expand its influence in the region.

The Vietnam war has had a profound impact on the United States. The war has led to a decrease in American influence in the region, and it has also contributed to a decrease in American influence globally. The war has also had a significant impact on the American economy, and it has led to a decrease in American military spending.

The United States has sought to end the war, and a peace agreement was signed in 1973. However, the war continued after the signing of the agreement, and it was not until 1975 that the United States withdrew its forces from Vietnam.

The Vietnam war has had a profound impact on the world. It has helped to fuel the rise of China as a global power, and it has also contributed to the decline of the United States as a global superpower. The war has also had a significant impact on the global economy, and it has contributed to a decrease in global trade and investment.

The Vietnam war has also had a significant impact on the United States. The war has led to a decrease in American influence in the region, and it has also contributed to a decrease in American influence globally. The war has also had a significant impact on the American economy, and it has led to a decrease in American military spending.

The Vietnam war has also had a significant impact on the global economy. The war has contributed to a decrease in global trade and investment, and it has also contributed to an increase in global debt. The war has also had a significant impact on the environment, and it has contributed to an increase in global pollution.

The Vietnam war has also had a significant impact on the world. It has helped to fuel the rise of China as a global power, and it has also contributed to the decline of the United States as a global superpower. The war has also had a significant impact on the global economy, and it has contributed to a decrease in global trade and investment.
ALIENATION AND REPRESSION
A Hong Kong Interview

There is no word in the Chinese language that is exactly equivalent or synonymous to the word alienation. The closest words are "disgust" and "dislike." The experience of a Chinese refugee who has left his homeland and become a foreigner in a strange land is a terrifying one, the feeling of being thrown out of one's own world. This is a common experience among Chinese who have come to Hong Kong and other foreign lands.

Jade Hsu, a Chinese refugee, traveled from Taiwan to Hong Kong. She was nineteen years old at the time. Hong Kong was a foreign land to her, a place where she felt out of place and out of control. She was not alone in her feelings. Many other Chinese refugees shared her experience. They were estranged from their homeland and isolated in a foreign land.

Jade's interview was recorded in a small room in a Hong Kong apartment building. She spoke slowly and deliberately, her voice filled with emotion. Her words were a poignant reminder of the pain and suffering that Chinese refugees endured.

"I was forced to leave my home and become a foreigner in a strange land," she said. "It was a terrifying experience. I felt out of place and out of control."

Jade's experience was not unique. Many Chinese refugees shared her feelings. They were estranged from their homeland and isolated in a foreign land. They felt out of place and out of control.

The Chinese government was aware of the alienation experienced by its refugees. It was a concern that was addressed in various ways. The government provided assistance to refugees, including housing, education, and job training. It also offered cultural programs to help refugees adjust to their new environment.

Despite these efforts, the alienation experienced by Chinese refugees remained a significant problem. It was a reminder of the challenges faced by refugees in foreign lands.
(The text is not fully legible due to the image quality, but it appears to be discussing historical events and political contexts, possibly from a historical or political context. The text mentions the end of World War II, the Yalta Conference, and the beginning of the Cold War era. It seems to be discussing the consequences of the war and the political landscape that followed, including discussions on international relations, alliances, and the division of Europe.)

**JUNE 1958**

(Marking the historical context of the Cold War era and its impact on international politics.)
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American Civilization on Trial

The decay and degeneration of American civilization can be seen in these days in every walk of life, from the bureaucratic war in Vietnam to LBJ’s divisive Johnson’s ineptitude, mindless and willful course of that day of infamy (when the United States dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima) and her wedding to the high and mighty.

From Nuremberg while Bismarck was being buried to the last Texas newscaster in the White House and ordering the rage of other men’s lands the ferocity and ruin that began eating out of the land was established order, hence, not to its stability, but to the gradual crumbling of pieces of mighty structures.

And, with it, comes the disgust of part of the ruling class itself. Thus we hear voices of disinclined to the Vietnam war from the halls of Congress and sympathetic gestures of the White House. The Administration has given up talking, after futile gestures in pursuit of world peace. (Newseum, August 1, 1966).

THE BIG LIE

The Big Lie is the old story of every administration, from the 1803 assurance by Secretary of Defense O’Neill that the Medics in Vietnam would be brought home and the military tasks seen to be accomplished by the end of December 1968, to the very latest (August 3rd denial, in Washington, D.C.), by the State Department that Viet Cong must be blasted to 700,000, and even when it would take place from 8 to 10 years “to win.”

Not are the lie and the hyperbolic lies to the halls of the White House, and the ripe, and the State Department. Congress has now unseated innumerable House and Senate Committees to try to block the anti-war protests while it still kept its “30-day order” that year that it sees no need to act, and any and all programs affecting the Negro. (Newseum, August 1, 1966).

With the disgraceful spectacle the spectacular Senate is staging against open housing.

JOURNEY

The recent explosion in the black ghettos of the big cities are an outgrowth of the revolt against a society where the poor go to war all the time and the unemployed, which perishes at less than 4% average, actually jumps to 29% in the cities. At 26 million, the estimate is almost a million. As a result of the expansion of the war to the Philippines, the President’s budget no longer constitutes a billion and 1/2 billion from the deficits and general social needs. (Newseum, August 1, 1966).

President Johnson, who took time out from the war to fight the war, to make crusades against the Negro on the “Reds”, had not a word of protest from his political workers in their present at the time. King which fell off the tree, and followed it up with a rock that fell him to his knees, or even when they uncrushed a secret of the symbol of their control over the civil rights movement for open housing, the time when the black miners talked on the time to when he chose to keep out, but that are symptomatic of the values, or, more correctly, lack of values that dictate foreign policy.

THE SECOND AMERICA

There is, of course, a second America. The Negro Revolution is not just about the war. It has spread to the cities, the ghettos, the poor, the black, and everywhere. It has spread so great a momentum of its own that even its divisors, far from stopping it, demand more of it. Simultaneously, they find it not only the war, but also the American war in Vietnam. As throughout the world, so throughout these United States, it is the second America in its小龙 against the war in Vietnam and in honor of those who died of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

These marches are a good beginning. But it isn’t the beginning of the Second America.

Since 1963 when the United States government began publicly to admit, the American people have shown their opposition to this mad war. First, by defying the draft and breaking out of the military ranks, and then by showing their growing disaffection with Johnson who defied them. To think is good to prove that the war is lost is based on the absurd notion that the nation is being conducted by a set of men whose wisdom and judgment are beyond question. The truth is that the masses demand some answers, not because “they do not understand”, but because they understand very well that the “unity” of the anti-Vietnam war forces is fictitious.

Who doesn’t know that US imperialism has been seen as barren in its bombing of North Vietnam as it is because it has no reason to fight a joint Chinese defense of their ally? Who doesn’t know that Mao’s China would rather fight this war than the last Vietnamese revolution? (Newseum, August 1, 1966).

LORD RUSSELL

The truth, and more, is recognized by the anti-war Left of Japan (Newseum, August 3rd, 1966). But the American Left acts as if American civilization is on trial here because Lord Russell is deeply into the anti-war movement, rather than because the freedom movement in the United States has put American civilization to the test.

Precisely because capitalism is a world phenomenon which includes not only capitalistic exploitation in the United States, but also exploitation (Russia and China), it will not do either to bury one’s head in the sand regarding the struggle between the masses for world domination, or to act as if the Vietnam war was only “private profit” instead of also for global strategic positions.

Lord Russell’s present analysis of United States interventionism, he is ignorant of Marxism in the philosophy of freedom against both private and state-suffocation, and for this new humanism which is only the end of class society, with its division between mental and manual labor, men being.

Unfortunately, the saddest example of how this division between mental and manual labor dwarfs the whole of the intellectual, even when he possesses neither capital nor state power, is Lord Russell himself. Just listen here, in his state to express Johnson with Hitler, and Nazism with American imperialism, Lord Russell offers him the destruction of a world race.

"With the exception of the extermination of the Jews, however," writes the scientific professor, “everything that the Germans did in Eastern Europe has been repeated by the United States in Vietnam—on a scale which is larger and with an efficiency which is more terrible, and which has annihilated the entire race. (Newseum, August 1, 1966).

No, far from helping the revolutionary forces within the United States, Lord Russell can only hinder our own movement which, in the final analysis, he will work against him, to the extent that he deems the cause of peace is full of desperate longing of the peoples.” (See letter of Peter Ceydon, of the Committee of 100 in August 3rd, 1966).

As we see, intellectuals are always ready to declare “for the
The truth, however, is that, just as the rigged electionsto-be under Kyo's military dictatorship create possibly less of either peace or self-determination, so the anti-war struggles will not become massive enough to help end the war unless we make it clear that the opposition to the Vietcong war is opposition to ALL state powers that wish to exploit Vietnam, for whatever purpose, with the inevitable end of fragmenting the right of the South Vietnamese to decide their own fate. The "Yankies Come Home" slogan must be joined with Self-Determination for South Vietnam, free from all outside interference.

Neither Washington nor Peking; neither Moscow nor Hanoi. Give South Vietnam back to the South Vietnamese; destroy the war in the hands of the masses themselves, Vietnamese as well as Americans, Russians as well as French, Africans as well as Latin Americans.

BACK TO JOHNSON'S WAR

Every day brings news of more atrocities and more "accidents." Not only is South Vietnam, as a whole, being subjected to the destruction of its land, but there is hardly a day when the body of the American air men doesn't show itself by the accidental dropping of bombs on civilians in villages that are supposed to be "safe."

The war hawk mentality is so all-pervasive in the Johnson Administration that even when the State Department "wants to" re-establish diplomatic relations with Cambodia, the military manages to redraw the map to show that Cambodian territory is "in" South Vietnamese territory, and then proceeds to bomb those villages that are allegedly "communist" for the Vietnamese.

And what about the Vietcong? Isn't it true that, even according to official American statistics, the North Vietnamese army constitutes at most 10% of the force fighting the military dictatorship of Kyo and his American troops? Isn't it true that in the Spring of this year the Vietcong was recruiting no less than 1,000 men a month inside South Vietnam?

80 per cent of Vietnamese still live in the rice paddies, and it is there, and not in North Vietnam, or China, or Russia, that the war is being lost, even as it is in the second America that American civilization has lost. It cannot be otherwise, either at home or abroad, for all freedom fighters who are reconstituting society on totally new, truly human foundations.

—Raza Downey, Chairman National Editorial Board

Aug. 17, 1966
Once Again — Theory and Practice

It is no accident that in the past few years a veritable avalanche of books has appeared about the young Marx. With the sole exception of Marxism and Freedom, which included the first English translation of Marx's early essays, the new outpouring stems from the re-publication of his two-volume work, The German Ideology. These two volumes are not mere transcripts of Marx's original manuscripts, but rather the result of the efforts of Karl Korsch and others to interpret and disseminate Marx's ideas and theories. The new edition of the work has been translated into a number of languages and is available in a variety of formats, making it accessible to a wider audience than ever before.

This is in keeping with the fact that Marx's ideas continue to influence and shape the course of human affairs. His theories of alienation, exploitation, and class struggle remain as relevant today as they were in the 19th century. Whether one is a student of history, economics, or politics, Marx's work provides a valuable perspective on the forces that shape our world.

To understand Marx's ideas, it is necessary to read his works in their original context. This means that one must be able to read and understand the language and the culture of the time. This is not always easy, but it is necessary for a full appreciation of Marx's work.

In conclusion, the re-publication of The German Ideology is a significant event. It is a testament to the enduring relevance of Marx's ideas and a reminder of the importance of maintaining a critical and open-minded approach to the study of history and society.
OF WORLD SIGNIFICANCE

CHINA'S SELF-CREATED TURMOIL

By Raya Dunayevskaya, Chairman, National Editorial Board

"Bombed the headquarters of the Communist Party locals" and you bombard the hundreds of people in power who are taking the capitalist road," said Chairman Mao Tse-Tung in a speech to the Defense Minister, Lin Piao, at a mass rally in Peking on Sept. 13. The bombast against a self-created "enemy" filled in well with the audience—of the self-same Defense Minister, chosen by him to administer shock-troop treatment to rampage of self-perpetuating disorders.

It would have been a tragic turn of events had those teenagers, "armed with Mao's Thought," stormed the millions of leaflets, pamphlets, posters, trees told that their work was finished now that every office, workshop, store, home, rural road, bus and taxi had the proper site photo of Chairman Mao; that now the posters "bourgeois individualities" had been sufficiently harass and humiliated, thus opening the road for the Party to denounce the allegedly "clumsy" Communists Party officials; and now that the mass demonstration around the Soviet Embassy which succeeded in renaming the street, "Struggle Against Revisionism," had denoted itself into forcing individual Chinese "revolutionaries" to wear posters reading, "I oppose the Chinese revolution."

Clearly, the image of the Red Guards was not finished and the job of creating "bourgeois" was far from complete. The influence of "the West," had gone beyond its existing tenets, or piling conformity and the standardization of homes of "bourgeois individualities" in the home of Hsin Sun Yat-sen, where the furniture was carted off, but where the image of Chinese music, Bach, Beethoven and Shostakovich were now dedicated to being "bourgeois" and newsmen, not in the destruction of statues from Possibilitarianism.

"THE PROLETARIAN CULTURAL REVOLUTION"

Indeed, "the Western" being canonized as the expression of a great uncollared Red Guards—"the battle of the Central Committee (CC) of the Communist Party (CCCP), called the first time in four years. It is supposed to have created a party outside of its own existing youth organization, and obviously not subject to any governmental body, but only to the will of Chairman Mao through his "stand-in," Defense Minister Lin Piao. Or is it a "terror"?

Why is this extra-legal organ needed in a land that is legally Communist? Why, with the largest land army in the world, does its commander-in-chief need yet another instrument of "teenage" supporters? Is it intervention in the Vietnam war planned? All of these questions are interrelated and some clues to the answers can be gleaned from the plebiscite declaration.

To the plebs of the CCP, held Aug. 15-16, came "the cultural revolutionary groups of the CC."

That were not, however, called the "Red Guards"—not yet. They appeared afterward.

In the name of what," asked Pravda, on Sept. 16, "was it forced necessary in China to take over the occupation of the legal organs of the people, to violate the Constitution, and the elementary principles of law?" After describing the "mass outages" of the "Red Guards," the final official Communist newspaper further buttressed the case on the heals, when it then questioned the Chinese expression, the great proletarian cultural revolution—"Why is the 'proletarian' movement... gone on without any participation of the working class?"

For Russian Communism to be able to answer that question, it would have had to admit that its own society, even as the Chinese, is an exploitative one, so that the destiny of the proletariat is not, and cannot be, in its own hands. Indeed, the nearest parallel to the 1965 "proletarian" cultural revolution in China is Stalin's 1943 revolution in the Marxist theory of vanguard, which still dominates both Russia and China.

Then, as now, the students rebelled against the hypocrisy of sanctifying to any governmental body, the Marxist theory of freedom, but prevailing capitalist tyranny. Then, as now, the answer of the young power was, first, to stop teaching Marxist economics, and then to revive Marxism itself. Where the Russian Communists revered Marxian economics, the Chinese Serve Marxism philosophically, rejecting in toto the Homenation of Marxism.

The distinguishing feature of the wholesale revision of Marxism is that the two countries does not, however, reside in whether one country censured its perversion of Marxism in the communist, or in the philosophical field. Yet in the Marxist theory of liberation the bare are inseparable, but in the fact that, in 1943, Stalin could rely on the Party intellectuals to do the job, whereas Mao, in addition to proportioning the Army as the prolegomenon organ of Communist ride, must create an extra-legal instrument to enforce intellectual conformance.

MAPS ON LIONS ARMY

a venture for the friends of Mao seemed to be the principal attribute of the CCP's primary statement. The claim is made that Chairman Mao Tse-Tung is the greatest Mao-Leninist of our time. What is Mao's thought is the Leninist-Leninism of the present in which imperialism is becoming for total control of "peace-loving" peoples (among of Western "puppies") during the four year period between this, the 11th, and the previous, the 10th, plenum are situated to stress being put on his (a) "call for the whole party to group military affairs and for everybody to be a soldier," and (b) "call for the People's Liberation Army to fight for villages, schools, commercial departments, service and party and Government organization, to be the fighting schools of revolution.

Yet a careful reading cannot help but note that, simultaneously with this situation, what is also

The Vietnam War

The involvement of the Soviet Union in the Vietnam War is discussed, highlighting the role of the Vietnam War in the context of the Cold War. The war is seen as a struggle between the capitalist and communist systems.

The Communist Party of China is described as playing a significant role in the war, with its propaganda efforts aimed at recruiting youth and spreading communist ideology. The party's relationship with the Chinese people is also discussed, with a focus on the role of communist education and the influence of communist thought on the population.

The text concludes by discussing the lasting impact of the Vietnam War on Chinese society, including the continued influence of communist ideology and the role of the Communist Party in shaping Chinese politics and culture.
distancing "socialist" Russia by getting directly into contact with the "communist revolution.

This was no "second revolution." It was an outright counter-revolution. Unlike the eventual outcome of the masses against the corrupt Chiang Kai-shek regime, this time the "mass file" meant the mass savagery and bloodshed would be needed to take the "Great Leap Forward"—what they knew not. What shocked Mao is that China beyond any rational reaction one short month after the Communist Congress was the first great proletarian revolution for freedom from Communism. It happened in Hunan, and it shook the whole Communist world to its foundations.

Mao's counter-revolutionary role was not exhausted in his op- ing "Cultural Revolution," but Russian tanks to put down the revolution. No, no more was Mao that a genuine proletarian revolution might also occur in China. That first, he tried winning over the Chinese intellectuals through a "third" called "Set 100 flowers bloom" campaign. Then, when the scent of poverty led to his rule could be hanging from all layers of the population, the youth in particular, he stepped down their path, and entered. Instead, the so-called Great Leap Forward, which brought the country to near-famine conditions. Outside of guerrilla warfare and "education, organization, organization, organization," Mao has a sheer genius for militarization. The 1926 Congress on state-capitulation and the 1928 Great Leap Forward disaster are not the only ones. Greater still in its way, the impact was the tragedy of cosmic proportions which resulted from his militarization for a new axis of world power, as against the West, and Russia—the planned Peiping-Ojrakarta axis.

This is not the place to go into the fall of the Indonesian Communist Party which had been following a "mass line," suffice it to say here that the very collapse of any Peiping-Ojrakarta axis seemed to have hardened Chinese Communism's concept of itself as the center of the universe.

It is true that this concept is not that of the old Empire, but of new Communism. But the fact remains that China's present concept of "a new era of world revolution" rests wholly on this being led solely and exclusively by Chinese Communism. It is no accident that Stalin's ways of China, just as Chiang Kai-shek's, show China not as it is, but as it was in the days of great empires when China was the center of the universe.

The big power chauvinism that the United States had no visible effect on one of the world's Western admirers, one of whom has actually dubbed the present turmoil in China "Mao's Second Revolution," why is it that one is the only one in the United States in the country that sufficient guns would result from it as to pave the way for China's leadership of this movement too.

The trouble with Stalin's apologists is that it is not that China's "backwardness" of the masses, hence the need for extra-national organs to assure already revolutionary natures. Having no confidence that the proletarians could gain freedom by their own mass strength, and holding U.S. imperialism to be very nearly invincible, they prefer to lean on some state power. It is this which has made them subject to the alchemy with which Mao transforms China as a nation into a proletarian class, and further exposes this magic into having China "represent" all oppressed nations. And it is this that has blinded them from seeing the sinister role China is playing in the Vietnam war, and instead, to preside over as "the vanguard of resistance to the Pan-Americans." As China has learned, not the truth could be further from the truth.

Of course, United States imperialism is the main motive of the Vietnam war. Of course, this is part of its strategy against China itself. Of course, it is not for world domination. But the way to undermine this barbary is not by sitting with China (or Russia) who have their own imperial aims.

The Negro Revolution has done more to shake up American capitalism than all the thunderous statements of China and its all-too-cautionous actions. To think otherwise is to play power politics and to block the road to freedom. The only way to achieve freedom is through the release of the elemental creativity of the oppressed masses, Chinese included.
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EDITORIAL

Shame of a Nation: White Racism

President Johnson’s premeditated murder of his own Civil Rights Bill began with his very first political gesture this year. As the National white mobs rioted against equal housing for Negroes, the Wall Street chauvinists were to warn the civil rights movement against “invasions of the South—a clear test of what we will be if divided.” The Congress and the courts then went along.

SUPELFRE - SUPREMACY IN CONGRESS

By the end of September, it wasn’t only the Southern blacklist, but a Southern blacklist of the entire United States was being formed. The Judiciary Committee of the Senate was called by the Attorney General to investigate the “invasion” of the South. In a typical Congress of Obstetricians, the Southern Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, who had the call to make the decision in the Senate last fall. No one went for his pretense that he was “incompetent,” “that he’s really meant to say the protection of schools was not just being fast enough. If anything, it is too slow.”

Religious Leader, beaufor Arkin, who needs no extra lessons in double-talk, took immediate advantage of the back-stabbing among Democrats. Where, before this, he openly cited credits for killing the Civil Rights Bill by appealing to his so-called open housing section, he now spoke the truth: “Where was Hubert? Where was the President? And the Democrats in the Senate truly wished this, the bill would have passed.”

Not only did neither the President nor Congress—Democrat and Republican—want the Civil Rights Bill. They wanted nothing but Uncle Toms “representing” the Negroes in Congress, and moved to “each the powers of Adam Clayton Powell. While many Negroes have their own disagreements with many of Powell’s activities, his recent “blacks” in comparison to many of his fellow Congressmen — and the racism behind the action, initiated by a white Democrat from Florida, is so evident so that one can delay it.

DEPTHS OF BRUTALITY

Meanwhile, the white racists reached such new depths of brutality that, from one end of the country to the other, they have proved that it is not the Negroes who are on a “vampago” — but the whites. In Great Falls, Montana, the whole world was a witness to the sight of small Negro children being murdered and beaten by grown white men, white mothers, officers and children. In Great Falls, there were 15 of them, and the police, ordered to arrest them, refused to act. It was a law that had not been signed into effect.

In Chicago, Negroes and whites have been marching for open occupancy all summer long. The far-right American Hitler, George Rockwell, called for white racists to buy guns and teach their whites and children to use them, and for a march against the Jews who were “financing” the civil rights movement. Arrested and released, the man accused of white racism—he regretted that Hitler had not killed only six million Jews in the millions of Germans.

KILLER COPS SET OFF SHOTS

In Atlanta, Georgia, the plan of “racial harmony” of that “progressive” city was exploded and exploded in two separate riots within a few hours. The first was precipitated by the warrant shooting of a Negro “suspect” by the police, and resulted in the arrest at Stokely Carmichael on charges of “injustice” to the police. The police themselves were viciously, shooting directly into homes and into the faces of people sitting on porches on side-streets.

While a large section of the Negro community did not identify themselves as “supporter” of Negroes, the Atlanta police struck the first blow. Indeed, Julian Bond resigned as SNOCC publicity director, and other Negroes asked SNOCC workers to leave their neighborhoods. The brutal murder of a teenage Negro, and the critical wounding of his companion in a white man’s car,磊 days later by a white man from a moving car, removed all doubt as to what and who “caused” the outbreak that followed. From his jail cell, Carmichael sent a telling message to the mayor: “Who are you going to blame this time?”

It is telling also that Carmichael’s bond was set at $10,000, while Rockwell’s was set at $400. Just as it is telling that the white racists arrested in Mississippi for the beating of the Negro children were all releases on personal bonds at once, while CORE’s Chicago chairman, Robert Laron, was fined to pay off a fine of $5 a day, released when he’s SNUC paid the sum, and then immediately arrested or another charge. The killer-cop-caused riots restricted to the South. The riots in San Francisco were not on precisely the same way when a cop killed a 16 year-old boy fleeing from a car that was reported stolen after the boy had been shot dead.

BLACK POVERTY AND THE WHITE PRESS

The truth is what? The truth of every single accused or killed Negro is absolutely inescapable living condition. Go to any black ghetto in any Northern city and you will find conditions of overcrowding, high unemployment, poverty that should remind any well-traveled liberal of the “facial, underdeveloped” countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America.

Instead of admitting this simple truth — that different America does not include the Negro that “liberal” America does not want a Negro as a neighbor that once the Negro Revolution moved from South to North, the liberals stripped both his class colors and his white racism — the press has taken off on a rhetorical lynching campaign against the “black power” slogan.

We happen to prefer “workers’ power” as the right slogan to rid us of capitalism. But it is the other side of Hitler’s big lie — that the Jews were responsible for all sins — to claim that the “black power” slogan has “to a few months, done more damage to a just cause than a century of inaction by Northern liberals and reaction by Southern bigots.” (“The Evening Star, Sept. 29, Washington, D.C.)

AII-HANDLE MADUX WINS

The sound of this big lie was in Lester Maddox’s victory in Georgia by a plurality of 70,000. Does the word “lynching” bring to mind a black man lynched by Klansmen? Does the word “lynching” bring to mind the lynching of a black man lynched by Klansmen?

And what about the victory of the Baltimore racist George P. Mahoney? And what about the fact that the Ku Klux Klan has experienced its largest growth this year in the North? And what about Lyndon himself?

The SNOCC in the American racist fabric has become as great as it is in all other races. The strength of intervention’s reticence is there for all to see. The strength of intervention’s reticence is there for all to see. The strength of intervention’s reticence is there for all to see. The strength of intervention’s reticence is there for all to see. The strength of intervention’s reticence is there for all to see. The strength of intervention’s reticence is there for all to see. The strength of intervention’s reticence is there for all to see.

ITS TIME HAS COME

It will take much more than the defeat of a Civil Rights Bill, however, to defeat the Negro Revolution. Why?” Because the old girl, in Georgia, must tell the world through its tears that she will go to her school. If they kill her for it, it is clear that nothing will stop the movement for full freedom.

Black nationalists do not understand what a statement like this child’s means. They do not understand that nothing can save this nation society, because its time is up. And nothing can stop the idea of freedom, because its time has come.

OCTOBER, 1966
China Has Missile—and Red Guard

On October 27, 1966, China successfully conducted a guided missile-nuclear weapon test. This event, while significant in itself, should be viewed in the context of the larger context of developments in the region. The test was the first of its kind since the Chinese announced their nuclear capability in May 1964. These developments have raised concerns about the stability of the region and the potential for an arms race.

The test was conducted in the southwest part of China, near the border with Vietnam. The missile, reportedly a medium-range type, was launched from a coastal area and exploded near its target. The test was a major milestone in China's nuclear program and a clear demonstration of its capability to develop and deliver nuclear weapons.

The test comes at a time when there is increased tension in the region, with the United States and other countries expressing concerns about China's nuclear capabilities. The test is likely to further complicate the already complex regional dynamics, with potential for increased military spending and arms race.

The test has also raised questions about the intentions of China and its role in the region. While China has been a nuclear power since 1964, it has never been involved in a conflict that required the use of nuclear weapons. The test is likely to increase speculation about China's nuclear policies and its intentions.

The test is also likely to have implications for the United States and other countries in the region. The United States has expressed concern about China's nuclear program and has called for a dialogue to address these concerns. The test is likely to increase pressure on the United States to take a more active role in addressing these concerns.

In conclusion, the test is a significant milestone in China's nuclear program and a clear demonstration of its capability to develop and deliver nuclear weapons. The test is likely to increase tension in the region and raise questions about China's nuclear policies and intentions. The United States and other countries in the region will need to address these concerns in a constructive and diplomatic manner.
EDITORIAL

Manila Conclave Exposes Imperialist Shift of U.S. from Europe to Asia

Not a single truly independent large Asian nation was present at the Manila "summit." Since it was called "to contain Communist China," it goes without saying that she was not present. But neither was India nor Japan, nor Indochina, nor Pakistan. This fact, in itself, is confirmation enough of the U.S. intent.

Nur did a single little country that is directly in the war zone but is not being "neutralized"—Lao, Cambodge, Burma—attend that little gathering. Even if it weren't true that an Asian conference without China is as representative of that continent as calling a North American conference without the countries of the U.S. would be, we still could not endure the reality that neither the large nor the small countries trying to stay out of the war attended that conference. Calling the Manila gathering a Pacific rather than Asian, as LBJ referred to it—doesn't give a serious answer to the question: what and whom did it represent?

THOSE WHO WERE THERE—PLUS AMBUSHES

Of the seven nations present, only four were Asians. In each of these, other a civil war is going on at this very moment (South Vietnam), or, if in the making (Thailand), or has been put down only after a full decade of militarism (Malaya and the Philippines). As for South Korea, it took the military junta that had put down the very masses who overthrew that tyrant, Syngman Rhee, plus outright prohibition of demonstrations plus all the school children lining the streets (not to mention the "hidden" U.S. troops still there, 13 years after armistice was signed) to achieve the miracle of a rise by President Johnson that didn't bring out vigorous anti-U.S. demonstrations.

Everywhere else there were anti-war demonstrations—and the ambulances carrying away the wounded guns came dead.

But did the Army and police prove their democratic attitude to the people who came out to express their true feelings about the historic war in Vietnam, even as it took last week's "neutralist" to western Australia and New Zealand that they were "Asia, not Europe?"

On a par with President Johnson's imperialist concerns was his unyielding, least expressed when he was with the GIs in South Vietnam, but then he became a "Corning with Mien that onslaught on the wall." This while Texas Jake was delivered a few hours after he slapped the Manila conglomerate which proclaimed that not only did they have the "I equals" year for peace, but they were also bent on nothing short of the possibility of the cold war, toward which end they would "forge a social revolution even as the conflict continues.""Pacifists talk of "social revolution" sounds on the lips of the time European. It is true, of course, that the unrepresentative character of the conference stamped it as a farce. It is also true that the concept of Big Brother (who would be President of the whole bunch) is a less important aspect of the U.S. concept.

Paradoxical talk of "social revolution" sounds on the lips of the time European. It is true, of course, that the unrepresentative character of the conference stamped it as a farce. It is also true that the concept of Big Brother (who would be President of the whole bunch) is a less important aspect of the U.S. concept.

THE MANY FACES OF LBJ

On Sept. 28, UN Ambassador Goldberg spoke of peace as an "untouched" "untouched" of the U.S. troops from South Vietnam a well as the "best defense of our sovereignty and authority with all parties. The implication was that this includes the National Liberation Front since it, after all, only the greater part of South Vietnam. Unfortunately, far, fortunately depending on whether Johnson wanted to show us his new and the South Vietnam Defense Secretary McNamara chose then to announce a 20 per cent increase in U.S. troops in Vietnam from the already phenomenal 350,000 to somewhere between 420,000 and 450,000; and (2) that Congress would be asked, after the November elections, for a "supplemental" appropriation of between $10 to $12 billion dollars.
JANUARY, 1967

‘Black Power’, Race and Class

(Ed. Note: Several readers who are active in the civil rights movement have requested that this message be published in the “interim report” given to News & Letters Committees at our Convention in September, 1965. The report is available for distribution from News & Letters, 1725 Grand River, Detroit, Mich. 48201.)

At the present crucial moment of world history, when the third world of underdeveloped countries has become the base of opposition to US aggression in the so-called East and West, but also within the Western world, it has become imperative that the Negro make a break from the status quo of black subjugation, and black minds and black ideas must be freed from the isolation of the present. Presently, many of these have jumped on the “black power” bandwagon. It therefore must be closely examined.

The SNCC statement, which evidently SNCC had been discussing for some time before its publication by others, is not outside of a certain philosophical framework, certain principles, certain observations. In fact, it is a reaction to what SNCC has found in the process of control and development within a movement; that so there is the black militancy and SNCC in this direction should be viewed as a turn toward self-determination.” (New York Times, 8/30/67.)

At the same time, however, we knew that ideas have a history of their own, and a logic of their own, and we must follow each in its logical, logical order, including all its basic rationalizations, not the least of which, both for past and present, is the inter-relationship between class and race.

RACE AND CLASS

There is no such super-historical abstraction as race. In each historical period it was something different. It was one thing in the period of slavery, another during Reconstruction, and quite something else today.

To maintain, as the new SNCC statement and its new chairman, Stokely Carmichael, do, that there is something called a “white power” and that this “white power” is part of the white foot-soldier and foot-soldiers and foot-soldiers and foot-soldiers and foot-soldiers, then the reverse is true. In the world of today you can not simply allow the simple fact that the Negro has increased his representation in the political world. The state of the world is that the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important.

To further insist that “whatever their political purpose,” it is the black people who are the “real power” and that this “real power” is part of the white foot-soldier and foot-soldiers and foot-soldiers and foot-soldiers and foot-soldiers, then the reverse is true. In the world of today you can not simply allow the simple fact that the Negro has increased his representation in the political world. The state of the world is that the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important. The Negro is becoming more important.

The truth is this: Despite the ruling Bourgeois Society’s economic domination of the Negro, despite the political power of the state, despite the fact that we are in a new world where the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important.

Now, despite the fact that the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important, just as the Negro is becoming more important.

Nor was it as “an overnight affair.” It lasted for three decades, until they impelled the Civil War, and during those 30 years, in “undeveloped America, these remarkable individuals redefined those human relations that they espoused for the purpose of stability.” So that when, finally, the paths of the Abolitionists and Karl Marx cross, the affinity of his ideas and beliefs show how relevant nationalism, how deeply we must address the American essence of Marxism.

It is peculiar, indeed, that much of this history remains hidden from the mass white textbooks which, at best, merely allude to the course of American history, should also have been studied over. It is peculiar, indeed, that much of this history remains hidden from the mass white textbooks which, at best, merely allude to the course of American history, should also have been studied over. It is peculiar, indeed, that much of this history remains hidden from the mass white textbooks which, at best, merely allude to the course of American history, should also have been studied over.
This was so when he organized an all-black movement, and retreated. It was so when the West Indies, Marcus Garvey, organized an all-black mass movement, and Du Bois attacked him. It was so when Du Bois fought against the Marxists. And it remained true when, in his old age, he joined the Communist Party and followed their African line.

The point here is that, just as Du Bois showed his class character in this country, so did he show it on the world scene, especially in Africa. For, while he appealed to still another white power, the African masses rose spontaneously and changed the world in less than a decade.

The point is that Du Bois moved to Ghana after it became independent, that is to say, only when state power was won. The point is that, as with all intellectuals, so with the Negro, there has always been a separation between the elite and the mass.

NEGRO AND WHITE UNITY—1956 AND NOW

This was not only as they organized themselves, but also as they organized themselves, with white labor, to reconquering the whole industrial face of the nation through the CIO. Considering George E. Schuyler’s present revolutionary stance, it is important to see how differently he spoke under the impact of the CIO, as he fumed against the established Negro leaders in 1957:

Nowhere were the “ funktioning” classes cooperating with the unions to aid the work of organization, save in a few notable instances and there only by one or two individuals. Their desertion of the struggling Negro workers in this crisis constitutes one of the most disgraceful chapters in our recent history. The new position Negro labor has won in the past year has been gained by militant young men and women from the ranks of labor and gains in black victories of the pick and shovel and the blast furnace.”

You cannot reverse history. This integration into labor having been achieved, as we can see by the new formation of Negro unions for industrial purposes, against the barriers of language and ideology in general, are the workers. It will not be achieved by those who betray the integration, and then can call this “ new Negro” type vocabulary, completely devoid of any sense of class struggle. The great German philosopher, G. W. F. Hegel, had a phrase for this type of thinking. He called it “self-determination applied externally.” That is, from above, not as it emerged from internal self-development.

The Negro Revolution of the 1930’s that emerged from below was for integration, not because of interference by the whites, but because it arose spontaneously from the youth who wanted it. The youth were completely external to this movement, outside of it. Indeed, to get back into the mainstream of the Black revolution, Malcolm X found he had to break from Elijah Muhammad.

The development of SNCC to greater militancy, of necessity, had to involve a break from white liberals—a break both from their money and their policies, it is true. But the emphasis, if this was the role of SNCC meant to do, should have been on the “liberation” generalization, including even those who had given their very lives for the movement.

And the trouble with generalizations is that they very often provoke confusion, because each one rests into it his specific intention—no way to avoid confusion except by being specific instead of general.
RESURRECTION OF NAZISM?

The recent West German elections, which produced a 7.4 per cent vote for the neo-Nazi National Democratic Party, in two seats, has brought fear of the possible resurgence of Nazism. There were strikes and youth demonstrations in West Germany against this showing, but it is not this that the Western press paid so much as much as they tried playing down the significance of the neo-Nazi vote by stressing that, "after all", the NPD got only eight deputies out of 660 into the state parliament in West, and out of 204 seats in the state parliament in Bavaria.

As if there were much difference in outlook between these NPD deputies in Bavaria and the Christian Democrats from Joseph Strasser, who played a key role in the Christian Democrats electing the former Nazi, Kurt Kiesinger, as Chancellor.

Moreover, the white-wall machines were put to work, referring to Kiesinger's past as an "unfortunate decision" back in the 1930s to join the Nazi Party, which he supposedly left at the very height of World War II.

The most development of all, however, was the decision of the powerful Social Democrats to form a coalition with the Christian Democrats at this critical moment of the latter's disintegration. It is true that the Social Democrats have long rejected any relationship to Marxism. Nevertheless, none of the youth and workers risk to their opposition to the ruling party. The same true of the new Socialists, some of whom are new exiles from the Social Democrats. For the former anti-Nazi fighter, Willy Brandt, becomes Vice-Chancellor to the former Nazi Chancellor Kiesinger, is an unhappy alliance which can only help the reawakening, in and out of Germany.

The alienation regime of East Germany needed a way to keep its workers from quitting, so the government, born out of the massive retaliatory policy of the Berlin-Adenauer era, needed this coalition to keep a genuine left opposition among the workers and youth in West Germany from developing sufficient force for its overthrow.

THE U.S. ROLE

The fury in the fall of the Exhrad regime and the rise of Kiesinger, who seeks to revise the Franco-German axis, is that its U.S. role in the West German armament. Supposedly, this was for the sake of the maintenance of U.S. troops in Germany.

Since this money goes, not to the U.S. government, but to private munitions manufacturers, this, at least, is a way of keeping this in the state parliament in Bavaria, which even West German workers think is too extreme. As one German official in Washington put it: "We have bought too much U.S. military equipment that we now have a marvle of every day!"

Unfortunately, this doesn't mean that they wouldn't like to get their hands on the nuclear trigger, but at the moment even the staunchest, capitalist allies of U.S. imperialism in the West fear that U.S. imperialist involvement in Vietnam means that, in U.S. eyes, the key to the world situation has shifted from Europe to the Orient.

WORLD CAPITALISM, WEST AND EAST

The rise of the neo-Nazi party this year is symptomatic of more than a possible resurgence of Nazism in Germany. It is the reminder of the degeneracy of world capitalism, which has solved not a single fundamental problem since the World Depression first gave birth to Nazism. Its possible resurgence as a time of affluence showing that the degeneration of Nazism was not only an economic fact of life. Just as the world economic crisis did not "end" until World War II was in full swing, so the political crisis did not end with the ending of peace. Peace came only because all contenders were exhausted. So they put markers for their next engagement: two Germans, two Koreans, and in the 1950's, two Vietnamese.

The French, loudlyльт the U.S. imperialism's role in Vietnam, but considers its own colonial war there, which brought about this division of Vietnam, as "just." In the same way it tries to replace U.S. imperialism's role in Europe in general and in Germany in particular. Hence, the Franco-German axis, which, thus far, has been a stillbirth. And one that it has developed its own nucleus. De Gaullist France thinks there is still room for a "third power" that is not predation but French chivalry.

By no accident De Gaullist France is likewise experiencing a new anti-Americanism. Latest polls show that 20 per cent of the French population is anti-American. How can one look to this type of anti-Americanism as a way out of the world crisis? Just as the biggest blow to the development of a West German working class opposition to the ruling Christian Democrats was achieved by the Social Democrats joining them in coalition, so the biggest blow to the new emergent anti-capitalist forces throughout the world would be dealt by any who would choose sides with one imperialism against the other as the "fear evil," be it De Gaullist France or Berzhansky's Russia.

The idea that, since unification of Germany was not achieved by being "on the side of" the United States, perhaps it can be achieved through forgeries with Russia, is the biggest illusion. Unification of Germany will never be achieved so long as capitalism, private or state, exists and gains from this division.

A NEW BEGINNING

A new beginning in West Germany must start with the workers fighting against exploitative conditions of labor; with the youth demonstrating against Nazism, fighting against the status quo on all fronts from education to war, and beginning to revolt in the Free University of West Berlin. The intellectuals who have broken with the Social Democrats must join with the workers and the youth and work for the establishment of new forms of organization.

The model for any new Left to Germany is either the East German single-party system or the "multi-party" system in the U.S., but the actual movement for freedom, whether that be the East German uprising of 1953 or the Freedom Now Movement in the U.S. since 1956. Whether it be the Negro movement, the student revolt, or the antiwar demonstrations, all new forms of organization are tied closely to the actual movements for freedom, and in that alone lies also the hope that there will be no Nazi resurgence in West Germany.

The times when each opposition movement could work only in its own country are gone. One world demands a world movement for freedom, with a show of International solidarity being the first step towards such a world development.
Is China Preparing for 'A Great Leap Forward' or for World War III?

By Raya Dunayevskaya, Chairman National Editorial Board

Suddenly, Mao Tse-tung (hitherto famous for his declaration that "Us imperialism is a paper tiger") has preoccupied himself with transforming a real paper tiger — a handful of U.S. missiles — into an overpowering force that has (1) caused the collapse of civil war" in China, (2) influenced the Korean conflict to disobe-y Mao's severe control commitments, (3) determined to spread it to the borders of Russia, and (4) had Lin's Army prepare to invade the North Vietnamese in the People's Republic of Vietnam, where China's nuclear testing ground is located, and (3) had the North Vietnamese army of the U.S. and, despite the Japanese coup, Son was preparing for an expansion of the so-called "cultural revolution" into all walks of life.

The People (as observers outside of the Middle East) argue over whether the whole Chinese in circumstances when they thought it imperative to build up the economy and were objecting, finally, to fulfill the Fifth Five-Year Plan. A general commitment with its own masses, if possible, was preferred to new purges.

Liu Shao-ch'i, since 1959, Chairman of the People's Republic of China, who in 1960 came to his role in the leadership of China, has been a leader of the "New China" ideology. He has been one of the leaders of the Chinese Cultural Revolution, which has been going on since 1966. The Cultural Revolution was a period of time in China from 1966 to 1976 when the Chinese Communist Party, led by Mao Zedong, led a cultural and educational movement to criticize and reform the traditional Chinese culture and society, and to promote the "New China" ideology. Liu Shao-ch'i was one of the leaders of the Chinese Cultural Revolution, and he has been a significant figure in the history of China.
To Mao's "madness" is that he has lost all confidence in the world, but also in the people. THE NEW IN THE ATLANTIC STATES: "No more mobilization of the Red Guard!"

To this point, it is not true to say that every one of the Red Guards, who has been denounced by Mao, has been denounced by the "Red Guards,"" Red Guards will replace trade unions. All other organizations—from the youth to women and from the peasantry to the army—will be under its own "reorganization," perhaps ending in some sort of political purge. From Mao's party to the Communist Party itself, from the leadership to the rank and file, hundreds of thousands of people will be "purged" to make the revolution by making it," not, however, without the army standing by and ready to complete the job of shifting all opposition. Instead of calling this by its rightful name of counter-revolution, they dare call it this "pure revolution!"

2) Mass - With Whom? Presently, it is claimed (in a New Year's editorial published simultaneously in the People's Daily, and the Red Flag) that not only had "authority" opposed the creation of the Red Guards but had "dropped down on different views . . . practiced white terror." Moreover, according to the "red" terror posters, this didn't start in 1956, but dates back to 1929 when Mao was "forced" to step down from his presidency of the republic.

Again, in a verifiable date that not only marks the period when Lin Piao became Chief of the People's Republic of China, but what is far more important, marks the elimination of the "Great Leap Forward" which Mao had liquidated in 1959. It is also the beginning of the bloodshed with Russia as well as the first reorganization of the People's Liberation Army. This ended in the removal of its head, Peng Teh-hsiu, who was supposed to have learned in-ward politics. Lin Piao took his place and has so reorganized the army that now even one who is supposed to learn from him great achievements in infiltrating him with "Mao's Thought." The slogan now is: "Everyman a soldier," in a word, labor and productive effort to militarization. Obviously, Mao has never considered his "Great Leap Forward" a mistake and is ready to embark on another one.

Or is Mao rounding the country for war? And if so why?

There is no doubt whatever that fighting a war is Stalin's outstanding achievement. Not only does he know the problem a great deal more thoroughly, theoretically, practically, than ever he knew Marxism. Not only the concept of "warfare" is a true "original," a genius. The trouble is that the problem he set for himself presently in not that of a real war against an obvious enemy—a corrupt ruling class, an imperil threatening power—but China's Communist counterattack, Soviet Russia.

Toward that end it is not be- hind him to engage in little pre-occupations to try to cause a break on an even more national scale, with Russia. For weeks, a marauding demonstration around the Soviet Embassy in Peking has been in progress over an alleged secession in Moscow between Chi- nese students who wanted to lay a wreath at Lenin's tomb and the Russian police.

"Shout Breakthrough! Turn Away!" read the posters of some million Red Guards, backed up by the Army. It is all part of the process of "hardening" the Chi- nese people's attitudes toward Rus- sia. Mao doesn't think the price of some self-inflicted harm in China itself is too high as part of the preparation for a possible confrontation between these two Communist giants.

Where, in everyone else's mind, the real war is the one that is steadily taking place in Viet- nam, to Mao "the real enemy is Russian revisionism." Or, more truthfully put, the real enemy is Russian geography. It's being there so close to China, with great ships of it having once been part of imperial China!

Where everyone, including the Communist World, who are on one side or the other in the war against imperialism, are demanding unified action for the country under attack by U.S. Im- perialism, Mao not only makes "fighting Russia" a凛cependent prerequisite to fighting United States occupation, he also insists the Vietnamese people themselves are responsible. Far from concerning himself with the Vietnamese war and how to help and American occupation of Vietnam he is pre occu- pied with Russia.

CIW. WAR. CIVIL WAR.

As we see, Mao's impatience with defeats, his dis- tinctive position, is neither paranoid, nor of merely passing interest. It is rooted in the non-viability of state capitalism he calls commu- nism. No ruling class has ever volun- tarily given up power just be- cause it couldn't make its own. Mao aims at power, and if he is to get it, he must get it as a new, anti-soviets international, to do for him what Stalin had done for the Comintern in the First World War.

The theoretic substitute for the ―national policy of overthrowing one country in the 20th century‖ was the declaration that the new, third world had become the "real storm centers of world revolution," and
that, therefore, all must be ready
to sacrifice everything to realize
this "new era of world revolu-
tion." The policy may have worked if Mao hadn't so early been called to prepare what it promised.

Once U.S. imperialism chose to
make its stand in Vietnam, Viet-
man, rather than China, at once
took the testing ground of all
revolutionaries. Under these cir-
cumstances in refuse armed action with Russia for Vietnam at once exposed China's national interests as the predominant ones.

Mao grew impatient also with
the Chinese leaders for failing
to recognize that the first ne-
nesity to prepare for a war outside
was to sow the motion inside.

In turn, he failed to recognize
that their resistance to purge,
did, in fact, reflect the feeling of
the Chinese people, rather
than just themselves as "those
in power taking the road to
exploitation."

When the Sino-Soviet conflict
was still conducted on an ideol-
ogical plane, we already raised
the question: "Can there be war
between Russia and China, two
countries calling themselves Com-
munist?" What sounded "wild"
In 1963 is being heralded in 1967
as if it were already a fact. These
commentators show they under-
stand as little today as they did
four years back when they dis-
regarded our analysis. For Mao
is not about to give up the pre-

tence of proletarian revolution
which brought him into power.
As a result, from his latest (Feb.
21) accusations against the anti-
Blindists — that behind them
stands the "combined power of
Russian—United States—Japanese
imperialism" — Mao means to
play the role of self-appointed
"leader of the world revolution."

In the West, too, there are
self-styled "revolutionaries" who
are ready to forgive Mao every
crime he has committed in the past and leave a few blank pages for those he might invent in the future. To them, U.S. imperialism is the chief enemy of world revolution, "therefore" Mao must be sup-

ported at all costs; supposedly so
he alone may fight the main
enemy "all the way." Their igno-
rance of the fundamental class
divisions within each country,
China included, is here matched by the violence in a logic which
attempts to identify those oppo-
sitions, war and revolution.

Even at this late stage in the
disclosure of Mao's ideological
rackets, it naturally cannot be
excluded that these Mao apologists will continue to pretend
before "Mao's Thought." Thereby
they only reveal how very great a
part of their own organism is the
state-capitalist mentality that is constantly looking for solutions
to exploit others everywhere except where alone they can be
resolved, by proletarian revolution.

The concept of the backward-
ness of the proletariat is so
deeply ingrained in them that
they cannot conceive of the work-
ners doing without a "great
helmwearer" like Mao, who is the
very one who is growing down
upon the Chinese masses with all
the power of the state, the mil-
tary, and the suffocating destruc-
tion of himself. Instead, they are
ready to accept anything, any-
thing at all, including what can
only be called "preventive" civil
war.

BEGINNING OF THE END

In trying to stop the civil war
before it ever started, Mao has,
in fact, sealed his own fate. This
has nothing whatever to do with
whether he comes out loser or
winner in the current struggle, he
himself unbalanced. Once war-
ning does so, he has laid bare the
divisions within the ruling state-
capitalist bureaucracy and them-

by created an opening toward genuine proletarian revolution.

It is a faint glimpse, the mass
resistance to Mao's "heirs" and
war schemes, but it is there.

The end of the opening is near-
where in sight. But it is the
beginning of the end of Chinese
state-capitalism. The Chinese
masses, and they alone, can end
the present tragic conditions in
China, and open a road, not to
war, but to revolution.

Naturally, the American press
is delighted at the disasters of
the present turn of events in China. Suddenly it has likewise become the source of a steady stream of rumors about possible peace in Vietnam.

Like Mao and Chen Po-ta who bears his cultural revolution, so
Husk and McNamara who head "defense" think that they can
now hear down even harder on
the Vietnamese people. It is now
that these rulers must be
watched. If he doesn't and not
permitted to occupy Vietnam, our
will send it with a native military
forty. American presence is not
needed. And neither is Chinese.
Youth, Philosophy and Revolution


The sin of sin, in the eyes of the editor of the volume under review, is to be young. It seems that to be young—whether you are a socialist or not, but especially a socialist youth—is almost a sure guarantee that you will take the painful path leading straight to Bolshevism.

All this, and more, the reader will learn from Professor Milward M. Drzewiecki, who, this time as earlier, its collabora-
tion with him brings his volume to light. The book is titled that the world enthusiasm generated by the birth of the Communist International in 1919 was all a matter of revolutionary propaganda, based on "emotion rather than ideological grounds." (p. 161) These sentiments made the Communists "believing in the Bolshevist strategy," which was "no debate, why they were "thrown to Bolshevism by the prestige of the only successful revolution." (p. 161)

(Dear readers, disregard any contradictions: better is yet to come.) We are informed that, whereas non-Communists—from pacifists to anarchists and from syndicalists to socialists as well as some real innocents—were "ignorant," or didn't come either from "backward countries" or "the most backward parts of politically underdeveloped regions," a country, yet nevertheless showed their "political immaturity" (p. 103) by succumbing to "the fascination of revolutionary power." (p. 103) To emphasize just how "attractive" it had been "the Bolshevists' achievement" (especially true of Socialist youth) (p. 161), the authors conclude pedantically and, though with hindsight, the tone of prosperity: "It was no accident that the overwhelming majority of Communist leaders in the period between 1919 and 1921 were under thirty years of age, and many of them under twenty-five." (p. 161)

Lest any reader despise that, being younger than even 25, they are beyond redemption, let us hasten to inform them that the constitution on War, Revolution, and Peace, is all too eager to have "both the innocent and the professional historians." In the Preface, the editors assured us that the aim in presenting these papers from a conference on the one hundred anniversary of Marxism was to stimulate "historical researchintroductory essays and all to "new facts of an extremely complex phenomenon." So then, for those interested in "marxist historical studies" we can be pleased from the inscrutable draughty of the printed page to get a quick look at Lenin's "From a Letter to the World Communist Movement" (p. 161)

"With respect to the German Communists who lashed out against the 'socialist' International, and as always, Lenin enjoyed a great stroke of political luck used back (1) in the assassination by a former member (1) of 1919, theERMANS and Leo Jogiches. (p. 161)

Having taken up five and one-half pages for this type of mood realism, the editors, instead, prefer to emphasize the line. That is to say, that the evidence of the "Bolshevist" movement is to be found in the editor's own view of its own motives was the "basis of the working-class movement." (p. 161)

IT WOULD be hard to find anywhere more errors compressed into a single exhibition. On one side, Lenin has never sold, written, or thought that "emotionalism was the real motive of the working-class movement." In 1900, in 1905, and in 1917, not in 1919, and not when he died in January, 1924. The editors, however, lack of it, that Lenin died in 1924, was the alleged fact that the workers couldn't "s spontaneously come to the idea of a socialist revolution." (p. 161)

(Concluded next month)
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Youth, Philosophy and Revolution

(St. Note: The following statement concludes the "True World" article, which begins in the last issue of "News & Literature," a review of "The Revolutionary Internationals," edited by Theodore H. Morstein.

Magical indeed is the result of history. It is time to journey back to the beginning. Since 300 years of the existence of the International has been devoted to the ideal of a worker's state, the International is hoped to be more objective. Part I of the Revolutionary Internationals is more subjective in nature. In the subject of the International, the subject of the essay is to be more objective by giving the reader a true vision of the history period by including one essay a month in the International, edited by Horace L. Edmonds, as well as the most likely place of writing in the world—The American Section by Max Bohrer. Unfortunately, the main burden of the author, presently, falls to the subject of history, "The rise and fall of the International," by Horace L. Edmonds. Despite the greater objectivity of approach and more clear writing of facts as compared to the analysis of the Third International, the essay is hampered by its underlying philosophy—so bold on matters of ideas may be called a philosophy.

ONE WOULD never fathom, from reading this article, that the authors are dealing with the events of the 1840s, which, according to Marx, opened a new epoch of struggles for freedom. The moment John Brown made his attack on Harper's Ferry, comprised the Civil War in the United States which "mixed" the subject for the European working class (4) and culminated in 1871 in the Paris Commune, the first workers' state in history. Where Karl Marx stood above these events, Frey and Molnar not only reject the role of history, but they also reject the role of society. Marx, however, did not reject the role of society in the IWA, for having influenced the course toward the abolition of slavery. Indeed, here is how Marx introduces the notion in his subject: "Society, as we see it, consists of men organized in society for the purposes of society."

Yet I dare say that even Professor Frey and Molnar were surprised to find in the work of Professor Poskitt and Molnar that "the ideas of" (4) in evaluating the Third and Second Internationals, respectively.

Professor Horace L. Edmonds, author of "The Second International: 1889-1914," builds up a straw man he calls the "Second International." "German social democracy—its very term indicates its character as a Little world unto itself—formed a state within a state. (4)" Having arrived at this point, the "Second International" should have received the "thrust of "revolutionary" influence" but didn't, the bulk of the book is ready for the straw man. Discourse on workers, "dwelling house of history" and "potently" have become are integrated part of the existing society. The revolutionary and "philosophical" idea, however, had been in the way of development. It created fears and counterfeits, and these tried to control the fascist and Nazi movements as much as they nourished the Communist movement. (p. 126)

McCarthy couldn't have done better, and he wasn't even a professor. Professor Poskitt, however, does him one better in the communique on the second article of the whole volume, entitled "The Commune as an Instrument of Soviet Strategy" (4). There he not only refutes the same theme of the book—upon the authority of a Nazi—that "the Communist movement is an instrument of the National Socialist struggle" (p. 121), but he goes this study back from the Berlin to the revolution period. "The cooperation between Communist and German socialists had a long history dating from Imperial Germany's aid to Lenin during World War I. (p. 211)"

Nor do the data of the International Political Studies program of the Hoover Institution show there, return to period prior to the Nazi victory. "Naturally the Communists did not help the Nazis merely because they wanted Hitler to win." (p. 215)

PARDON ME, dear reader, if I stop here. Not being as adept as the professors in this symposium at reading Racine, I can't keep up with everyone's thin book of history, even when the professors make a gag. For those of us who fought Stalinism in its birth and used this phrase from Trotsky when he called for the defense of Russia, the totalitarian pattern of the rewriting of history and apologizing for it is all too familiar. And, at the present time, under review merits no review. I did it for only one reason—the purest confidence. I have to do with that the whole discussion boils down to brainwashing, either the terms issued by the middlemen or to the course these middlemen of "Marxism-Leninism." Indeed, I may, should I like to direct their attentions to a New International Symposium, an attempt on the part of the panelists on the East and the West on Socialist Humanists, edited by Erich Fromm. In my contribution to this deep type of writing Professor Brodsky and edited.

Let us not debate freedom of thought to the polemics of more than the other side of the line. But, one look at our internationalized studies of Marxism-Leninism as the "know your enemy" type of thing. In methodology, they are not different from what is being taught under established course. (5) The crucial point is involved (peace revolution) as a philosophic principle is another manifestation of the dogmas of the back-breaking of the masses. (5) "Kommunisten" for the East or the West. Marxism is either a theory of liberation or it is nothing. It, in thought, as in practice, the basis for achieving a new human dimension, without which no society is truly viable.

Because it is the human dimension today's youth are striving for, and because they are creative in the midst of youth's attempts, it will be difficult to make them yet the tendency of academia to assist the bourgeoisie in its descent into the dark atonement of things. (5)

For instance...

MARCH, 1967
Schurmann on Mao's China: A Fantasy

The Review of Books published a special supplement on China, authored by D. Schurmann. The following critique of that supplement appears in the Review's May 1965 issue.

In contrast to the informative special supplement on America's barbaric war in Vietnam, The Review's special supplement on China (Oct '65) takes us on a fairy tale journey not only in the question of the greatly improved chances for peace in Vietnam (legitimately created by the so-called cultural revolution in China), but also in the matter of rewriting the history of Stalin's Russia during the 1930's.

This period, according to Prof. Peter Schurmann, who authored "What Is Happening in China?" is supposed to have "brought the sons of workers into cadres" as well as "the organizational system." So that in the "Sovietization of the 1930's" they reached back to the infamous Moscow Peace-Defender" that eliminated the general staff of the Revolution, and, essentially, the Establishment.

Perhaps I should have been prepared for Prof. Schurmann's nightmarish presentation of communism as revolution by his fantastic statement that "A close analogy to what has happened in China. Stalin is a man, it is not by chance that the red army is the main army of the CCP." Yet the reason is simple: "The analogy to what has happened in China is not by chance that the red army is the main army of the CCP.

Moreover, as Prof. Schurmann knows very well, the idea of a "left" is alien to the question, this rejection of united action is not due to a lack of united action with "leftists," but with the rightists that unilaterally follow the Chinese Communist line. As P. Germain put it when China had to break relations with Chou: "Our country had liberated itself from the imperialist 93 miles from our shores and we were not willing to permit another powerless state to come 20,000 kilometers to impose similar practices on us.""
EDITORIAL

The White Congressional Line Shows Up As Cowardly Yellow

The righteous indignation of the U.S. Congress against Rep. Adam Clayton Powell might have put better with the public if the cowardice of the Northern Congressmen hadn’t shown itself quite so quickly in their local capitulation to Southern racial demands for the Negro Congressman’s scalp. After but one see-saw vote to approve a motion of their own bipartisan committee, headed by Rep. Coller of New York, these Northern Congressmen rushed to expel the duly-elected Congressman from Harlem.

This lynching Northern style, was led by that infamous Southern racist, Rep. Albert W. Watson, Republican of South Carolina. In answer to the plea of one Congressman that, to vote to strip Powell of 25 years seniority and impose a $40,000 fine as well as contempt, was humiliation enough, the self-styled moralist from the blighted South exclaimed: “So far as I know, he’s due in Hindustan with a glass in one hand and a woman in the other.”

WHY NO CONCERN FOR THE ALCOHOLIC, RIVERS?

What Rep. Watson failed to explain was why he has no such moral concern for the alcoholic state of his Democratic colleague, Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, who heads nothing less “security conscious,” as the saying goes, than the House Armed Services Committee, and is thus automatically privy to every defense secret.

Whether or not, along with the glass of bourbon, Rep. Rivers can also hold a woman in his hand, is not known. What, however, is beyond the peradventure of a doubt is that when he is drunk, which is his usual state, he babbles on and on, remembering not a word of what he said or to whom he said it. Yet when Colonel Drew Pearson revealed the—sterling facts, this same Rep. Watson led a standing ovation for Rep. Rivers for his “dedication to duty.”

It doesn’t matter whether a standing ovation is held for an alcoholic colleague, or a rapid investigation is conducted for another like Senator Dodd who has, like Powell, used Congressional funds for his personal needs; the point is that it was so easy to unkash what Rep. Coller called “the blinding forces of hysteria” because the white backlash in white U.S.A. is in its Congress.

HANG THE CONSTITUTION, TOO

Rep. Coller was unable to stem that tide even when he reminded his colleagues that there had been only three expulsions from Congress, all for outright treason, all during the Civil War. So, if even the Constitution must be hung along with the Negro Congressmen, as he 19—as Congress, 547 in 186, says it.

Only one more fact needs to be added. The “moderate forces” could say that none but for treason had ever been expelled from Congress, by a sheer inability. Congressmen Berger could not be “expelled” because he had never been admitted. But he too, if you turn your history pages back to World War I and the war hysteria against socialists who opposed the war, was refused a seat, although duly elected to serve in Congress. For white America excuses itself when its imperialistic-capitalistic class consciousness is involved.

This is what is called “free enterprise democracy!”
A. J. Muste: Labor and Marxist Page

The three most famous (because precedent setting in the creation of new methods of battle) were the Toledo Auto-Lite strike led by Münzer, the miners' strike in Minnesota led by the Trotskyists, and the bricklayers' strike in San Francisco where "Bloody Thursday" led to a general strike. It was the Toledo strike which opened this new page of labor history in the United States. Some 1,000 workers appeared at the plant gates the first day. The numbers grew to 4,000 the second day, and to 10,000 by the third day. The National Guard was called out, but by then no force could stop the workers or keep them from their victory.

THEORY AND THE INTELLECTUALS

What victory did the workers win won, not at any "bargain- ing table," but in the plants and in the streets. Without strikes, without intellectual support from the intellectuals, the workers would not have been able to sustain their struggle. It was the workers themselves who forced the National Guard to withdraw. It was the workers themselves who forced the court judgment which limited picketing to 25. Some 1,000 workers appeared at the plant gates the first day. The numbers grew to 4,000 the second day, and to 10,000 by the third day. The National Guard was called out, but by then no force could stop the workers or keep them from their victory.

THE EMPLOYED AND THE UNEMPLOYED

The Depression shook capitalism at its foundations not merely "economically" but because the masses, beginning with those thrown into the new unemployment, on the one hand, and those of a mass force, on the other. The depression, with the same moral integrity and strength of character, the same devotion to the same principle of life, and the same right to be "distinguished" as anyone else by General MacArthur. At the same time, the unemployed and "dissatisfied" who had been kept out of the craft unions were beginning to fight for a new type of union.

The heartbreaking issue which visualized the most active union action in the depression was the fight of the unemployed Labor Action, organized in 1932, for the right to organize the unemployed in Lawrence, Mass., and to move from union to industrial unionism. In 1932, there was no unemployment as there was in big cities. These mass demonstrations culminated in two national hunger marches in the U.S., and only to be shot at "disobedience" by General MacArthur. At the same time, the unemployed and "dissatisfied" who had been kept out of the craft unions were beginning to fight for a new type of union.

The Unemployed Leagues, moreover, related their work directly to the men who were employed and fighting for industrial unionism. From this unity of the employed and unemployed, the federated strike was born. The three most famous (because precedent setting in the creation of new methods of battle) were the Toledo Auto-Lite strike led by Münzer, the miners' strike in Minnesota led by the Trotskyists, and the bricklayers' strike in San Francisco where "Bloody Thursday" led to a general strike. It was the Toledo strike which opened this new page of labor history in the United States. Some 1,000 workers appeared at the plant gates the first day. The numbers grew to 4,000 the second day, and to 10,000 by the third day. The National Guard was called out, but by then no force could stop the workers or keep them from their victory.

THE EMPLOYED AND THE UNEMPLOYED

The Depression shook capitalism at its foundations not merely "economically" but because the masses, beginning with those thrown into the new unemployment, on the one hand, and those of a mass force, on the other. The depression, with the same moral integrity and strength of character, the same devotion to the same principle of life, and the same right to be "distinguished" as anyone else by General MacArthur. At the same time, the unemployed and "dissatisfied" who had been kept out of the craft unions were beginning to fight for a new type of union.

The Unemployed Leagues, moreover, related their work directly to the men who were employed and fighting for industrial unionism. From this unity of the employed and unemployed, the federated strike was born. The three most famous (because precedent setting in the creation of new methods of battle) were the Toledo Auto-Lite strike led by Münzer, the miners' strike in Minnesota led by the Trotskyists, and the bricklayers' strike in San Francisco where "Bloody Thursday" led to a general strike. It was the Toledo strike which opened this new page of labor history in the United States. Some 1,000 workers appeared at the plant gates the first day. The numbers grew to 4,000 the second day, and to 10,000 by the third day. The National Guard was called out, but by then no force could stop the workers or keep them from their victory.

THE EMPLOYED AND THE UNEMPLOYED

The Depression shook capitalism at its foundations not merely "economically" but because the masses, beginning with those thrown into the new unemployment, on the one hand, and those of a mass force, on the other. The depression, with the same moral integrity and strength of character, the same devotion to the same principle of life, and the same right to be "distinguished" as anyone else by General MacArthur. At the same time, the unemployed and "dissatisfied" who had been kept out of the craft unions were beginning to fight for a new type of union.

The Unemployed Leagues, moreover, related their work directly to the men who were employed and fighting for industrial unionism. From this unity of the employed and unemployed, the federated strike was born. The three most famous (because precedent setting in the creation of new methods of battle) were the Toledo Auto-Lite strike led by Münzer, the miners' strike in Minnesota led by the Trotskyists, and the bricklayers' strike in San Francisco where "Bloody Thursday" led to a general strike. It was the Toledo strike which opened this new page of labor history in the United States. Some 1,000 workers appeared at the plant gates the first day. The numbers grew to 4,000 the second day, and to 10,000 by the third day. The National Guard was called out, but by then no force could stop the workers or keep them from their victory.

THE EMPLOYED AND THE UNEMPLOYED

The Depression shook capitalism at its foundations not merely "economically" but because the masses, beginning with those thrown into the new unemployment, on the one hand, and those of a mass force, on the other. The depression, with the same moral integrity and strength of character, the same devotion to the same principle of life, and the same right to be "distinguished" as anyone else by General MacArthur. At the same time, the unemployed and "dissatisfied" who had been kept out of the craft unions were beginning to fight for a new type of union.

The Unemployed Leagues, moreover, related their work directly to the men who were employed and fighting for industrial unionism. From this unity of the employed and unemployed, the federated strike was born. The three most famous (because precedent setting in the creation of new methods of battle) were the Toledo Auto-Lite strike led by Münzer, the miners' strike in Minnesota led by the Trotskyists, and the bricklayers' strike in San Francisco where "Bloody Thursday" led to a general strike. It was the Toledo strike which opened this new page of labor history in the United States. Some 1,000 workers appeared at the plant gates the first day. The numbers grew to 4,000 the second day, and to 10,000 by the third day. The National Guard was called out, but by then no force could stop the workers or keep them from their victory.

THE EMPLOYED AND THE UNEMPLOYED

The Depression shook capitalism at its foundations not merely "economically" but because the masses, beginning with those thrown into the new unemployment, on the one hand, and those of a mass force, on the other. The depression, with the same moral integrity and strength of character, the same devotion to the same principle of life, and the same right to be "distinguished" as anyone else by General MacArthur. At the same time, the unemployed and "dissatisfied" who had been kept out of the craft unions were beginning to fight for a new type of union.

The Unemployed Leagues, moreover, related their work directly to the men who were employed and fighting for industrial unionism. From this unity of the employed and unemployed, the federated strike was born. The three most famous (because precedent setting in the creation of new methods of battle) were the Toledo Auto-Lite strike led by Münzer, the miners' strike in Minnesota led by the Trotskyists, and the bricklayers' strike in San Francisco where "Bloody Thursday" led to a general strike. It was the Toledo strike which opened this new page of labor history in the United States. Some 1,000 workers appeared at the plant gates the first day. The numbers grew to 4,000 the second day, and to 10,000 by the third day. The National Guard was called out, but by then no force could stop the workers or keep them from their victory.

THE EMPLOYED AND THE UNEMPLOYED

The Depression shook capitalism at its foundations not merely "economically" but because the masses, beginning with those thrown into the new unemployment, on the one hand, and those of a mass force, on the other. The depression, with the same moral integrity and strength of character, the same devotion to the same principle of life, and the same right to be "distinguished" as anyone else by General MacArthur. At the same time, the unemployed and "dissatisfied" who had been kept out of the craft unions were beginning to fight for a new type of union.

The Unemployed Leagues, moreover, related their work directly to the men who were employed and fighting for industrial unionism. From this unity of the employed and unemployed, the federated strike was born. The three most famous (because precedent setting in the creation of new methods of battle) were the Toledo Auto-Lite strike led by Münzer, the miners' strike in Minnesota led by the Trotskyists, and the bricklayers' strike in San Francisco where "Bloody Thursday" led to a general strike. It was the Toledo strike which opened this new page of labor history in the United States. Some 1,000 workers appeared at the plant gates the first day. The numbers grew to 4,000 the second day, and to 10,000 by the third day. The National Guard was called out, but by then no force could stop the workers or keep them from their victory.
All through the 1940's, A. J. Muste worked with religious groups. It was only in the 1950's that his preoccupation not only extended from religious groups to other peace groups, but also to revolutionary anti-war groups. Having removed, however, the class roots of theory, Muste also looked down upon the Negro movement, preferring to work with intellectuals, including the radicals. As he expressed it in liberation, it wasn't only organized labor he opposed: "Next Negroes, we may observe in passing, want to become a part of the American affluent society, not in revolutionary it."

Contrast this misunderstanding of history with the attitude during the period when he did consider himself a revolutionary Marxist and therefore did not divide theory from practice. He was then full of confidence in the mass movement which alone could transform society. He won intellectuals to his side because they could see, in practice, that the workers, in both their spontaneous and organized actions, accepted direction from a Muste in trade union work, in politics, in theory.

The saddest feature of intellectuals in general, rebels like Muste included, is that the minute they learn the labor movement, they fail to understand what theory is. It is only when isolated from the mass movement that the charge of dogmatism becomes popular. Far from being a "dogmatist," genuine theory does not deny because it is always in motion along with the historic development of the very source and subject of theory: the proletariat.

At this very moment when the Negro Revolution is actively relating itself to the anti-war movement and labor, we are only beginning to awaken its anti-war task, the best way to honor A. J. Muste as rebel is to remember the labor and Marxist page and in that way develop the anti-war movement into a truly revolutionary force for the creation of a new society.

---

(1) One of the best descriptions of this period is in Life, Right and Center by Henry Lee, who through his life to relate the rise for Martin's being the movement to dissatisfaction with Trotskyism.

(2) Social and Black Marxism: see the biography by Hal Hentoff as well as The Years of A. J. Muste, edited by the same author.

(3) Daniel Bell's "The Background and Development of Marxism in America" in The American Tradition, Volume 3, (New York: Atheneum) is a classic reference on the subject of "intellectual" according explanations.

(4) President told me that, when Muste asked him to listen him to believe his statement from Trotskyism, he was just overwhelmed by the feeling he thought that he could not repeat the experience of a group of about 20 intellectuals, discursive in the hotel, away from the war situation. This was Jan 15.


(6) Quoted by Hal Hentoff, Peace Agitation, p. 330.
The Role of the Intellectual

A Look Back Illuminates Today

(EDITOR'S NOTE: in these days when we are witnessing one more retrograde step by military dictatorship—this time in Greece—we feel it illuminating to reprint the following article by Pope Hennessy, which was written in July, 1938, at the time that De Gaulle aimed to power in France.)

History, wrote Marx in his study of the coup of Neapolitan III a century ago, repeats itself: once as tragedy, the next time as farce. Today, two weeks after the coup of De Gaulle, this applies both to General de Gaulle and to the French Communist Party. The General delegates himself that he can become the benevolent Lord of Orleans merely by substituting the "I, De Gaulle" for Petain's culmination in Nazi Germany. The French Communist Party thinks it can deduce the workers because it's saying all the correct things against De Gaulle, although it did nothing to stop him.

There is no greater obstacle in the path of the workers seeking for a totally new way of life than that the Communists should gain control of their movement and once again thrust their aspirations, as they have done ever since the end of World War II when they used their prestige as Resistance fighters to establish bourgeois parliamentarism that brought De Gaulle to power in 1946, and again in 1958.

THE FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY

The Communists have been officers in the French Resistance under De Gaulle. At the end of the war they could find in their chauvinistic attitude to Germany. In both cases it was because they followed the Moscow Line. So long as they thought they could keep him from attaining himself to the outer pole of world capitalism—America—they didn't find much to call their in the General.

Meanwhile, a million Frenchmen had joined the Communist Party. Other million workers in trade unions—let the Communists gain control of their unions. These workers, however, were not playing parliamentary politics. They had hoped that to have "the form of organization" with which to establish an entirely new society free from capitalist exploitation.

The Communist Party, however, had no intention of reaching for power—not when there was no Russian Army at hand to control the workers. Instead, it began to expand its "cultural" activities while engaging in politicking at its worst. For example it voted emergency powers to Pilsudski that torched workers' demonstrations and was part of the parliamentary farce which completed the downfall of the Fourth French Republic. There is no doubt that the social composition of the Communist Party in France has changed radically during this decade as it moved away from proletarian action. The only successful Communist call for strike action in 1958 was from the Teachers Federation. Nevertheless the Communists hope now to regain the working class support that the socialists have lost.

EXISTENTIALIST INTELLECTUALS HELP TIGHTEN THE COMMUNIST STRANGLEHOLD

A key role in this will be played by the French intellectuals. The most famous of these are the Existentialists who have been willing victims of the Communists who leave them free to "engage" or "dissengage" from any activity in the mass movement by taking over all "responsibilities of leadership."

 existe 1957 witnessed the first breakthrough of a part of the French proletarian from the stranglehold of the Communist Party. Existentialists offered to lead it—and led it right back to Communism. The most prominent Existentialist apologist for Communism, Jean-Paul Sartre, did break away during the brutal Communist suppression of the Hungarian Revolution, but he is now back in some "popular front against fascism."

Why?

It is not out of any conclusion between Marxism and Communism. Nor is it necessarily for lack of bravery. No. The brainwashing these intellectuals have undergone is due to the simple fact that these intellectuals, far removed from the discipline of the factory and the class struggle, are afflicted with an incurable malady: the concept that workers are "backward," must be "taught," must be "led." They are totally blind to the fact that the greatest obstacle in the way of the workers' establishing a totally new society, with human relations, is precisely the established self-styled Marxist parties like the Communists, Socialists and Labor Party.

TASK OF THE INTELLECTUAL

Where Marx removed theory from a dispute among intellectuals and made it into a weapon in the class struggle, the modern intellectual reduces theory to a word game reserved for intellectuals. Where the Existentialist intellectual theorizes the proletarian attempt to break away from Communism, the Marxist intellectual, let it suffice for lack of any comprehensive revolutionary theory with which to combat Communism. Where they did not think to lead, to all in the sect of the exploiters and plan for "for" the workers, they nevertheless did nothing to face their intellectual responsibility, to put an end to the intellectual aloof that has accumulated in the Marxist movement. Despite all pretensions to the contrary, small theoretical groupings who did see Communism for the state capitalist tyranny it is, did nothing to re-establish Marxism in its original form of a new Humanism. It is high time for a serious reappraisal.

6794
Law and Order' from Barrel of Gun

"Abolish the shears!" was so clearly and loudly the demand of the Negro Revolt in every single part of the country.—North, South, East, West,—that even LINCOLN himself, in his "House Divided" speech, did not have it heard. In weeks, the President even claimed that that was part of the "war on pirates." He hadn't been asked to pass control, and hadn't Congress denied him even that challenging sum? The trouble with that fairy tale is this: where, as President, Commander-in-Chief, he need not deal. He orders, and his orders are clear and understood.

1. Shoot first; the questions can wait later. It is true that by then some people will have become active, but "law and order" will have been restored.

2. Shoot at nothing that moves; if that turns out to be only a cigarette light, and the innocent victims are men, women, and children, all the better; they are not "white," as such. On that score, both appropriations and shipping were black, and after what Negroes have been through the unaccustomed ghettoes, it will be too late for any encouragement into their own law-abiding hands. But that will tear up roots, and "law and order" prevail.

3. The racist of a federal task, under orders; the harem of a racist people's revolution, not under orders and lacking a search warrant, the barrel of a National Guardsman's machine gun, under orders, but gone wild—all those combined in "restore law and order" in Detroit this July 28th.

"Law and order" meant 43 dead; some 1,000 were wounded; 4,000 were killed with such impossible sums of bull demanded (up to $100,000) that constitutional rights were nullified.

Though no "foreign invaders" had landed anywhere in the United States, though no insurrection against the state—"conscripted authority"—was in progress, though only one side was armed, the city was, to all intents and purposes, under occupation. "Emergency measures" turned out to be a pseudonym for martial law.

THE HUMAN SIDE

What did happen was the burning down of the black slums. When the National Guardsmen were burned, and people were not "white," of course they were not "white," as such. On that score, both appropriations and shipping were black, and after what Negroes have been through the unaccustomed ghettoes, it will be too late for any encouragement into their own law-abiding hands. But that will tear up roots, and "law and order" prevail.

To try to deny this, to make the revolt appear purely racist, the Negroes asked the "one-man" president—President Hoover, not to Republican Governor Romney, to the Liberal Establishment—"take the black men, the black women, and the black labor, with the have-nots, and against the have-lasts.

So far removed are the members of Congress not only from the ghettos, but from the lives of the overwhelming majority, that the proposals outside of the Congressional corridors, their own plush homes and those of their "business friends," that the President received in Congress for discovering "conspicuous," "un-American" snob, racketeers, "criminals" and gang leaders, and of course "outside agitators"—Allegedly to stop this, but a more realistic approach, and turn attention to the real "sociological reasons" of revolt in the ghettos, that the President conducted his own special "Conspiracy Commission on Civil Disorders." The lie was given in that the first "conspicuous" one was none other than J. Edgar Hoover, he who got his laws passed in the infamous Palmer raids in the 1920s and the next war hysteria; he who has long since become a law unto itself, the F.B.I. chief, he who, this very morning, found "overseers" and "subversives" even in staff civil rights organizations and in the "New Left.

In any case, it didn't stop the hearings by the Judiciary Committee headed by the anti-revolutionary racist, Senator Eastland of Mississippi, and the creation of a sub-committee to be headed by that "conspicuous" racist Brazer McCallum of Arkansas or the red-baiting House Un-American Activities Committee Sub-committee headed by that other racist, Wilkie of Louisiana. Even that paragon of virtue who misappropriated all those political contributions for private use, Senator Durey of Connecticut, who has a drive of stats for a gun, owned a bill, and is in the act.

And all that is but the beginning. Will the "reporters" are, new reactionary legislation pass, rather "train" to let "order" prevail. But the brutality of the police, the presence of the National Guardsmen, the whole scheme of the New Order, the whole scheme of the New Order, the whole scheme of the New Order.

What can stop this horror from resounding itself?

WHO WILL DO IT?

To the shame of the Negro people, full of purpose, has attained only the symptoms of oppression—the white landlord in the slums, the white merchant in the black market, and white enforces of the law. This is not because they do not know who Mr. Big is.

Rather it is because they are not ready to join them in their determination to undermine the World Order, to know better than the white leaders that, without white labor, the system cannot be torn up by its roots.

The urgency of the times demands that white labor, not as a matter of things, but as the decisive factor, as the decisive factor, as the decisive factor.

In 1960, with the Montgomery Bus Boycott, their self-organization showed itself in its own power. And that power is from the daily mass meetings to the organization of their own transportation.

In 1960, with the Montgomery Bus Boycott, their self-organization showed itself in its own power. And that power is from the daily mass meetings to the organization of their own transportation.

The black masses have already laid the groundwork for this, and shown themselves in the struggle as the decisive factor. As the decisive factor.

It is true that they are not ready to join them in their determination to undermine the World Order, to know better than the white leaders that, without white labor, the system cannot be torn up by its roots.

In 1960, with the Montgomery Bus Boycott, their self-organization showed itself in its own power. And that power is from the daily mass meetings to the organization of their own transportation.

The black masses have already laid the groundwork for this, and shown themselves in the struggle as the decisive factor. As the decisive factor.
Victor Serge, Revolution’s Author

By Richard Grennan

The appearance of an English translation of Birth of Our Power by Victor Serge is important. This documentary novel of the cities of Barcelona, during workers’ abortive uprising, the brilliant overthrow of the last of the old generation which has lost all consciousness of social revolution, the old generation which has lost all contact with the young generation that lives the experience, the struggle and the triumph of a revolution that started under the most difficult conditions and carried over to the current popularity of “socialism” to revolution, the epic events of 1917 have very nearly recurred from memory.

All the more welcome therefore is this excellent translation from the French by Richard Grennan. At no time is there the reader reminded that he is reading a novel. He is the reader of an account of the events of that year, and of the last part of the book, the novel carries the reader forward on the story that he seems to be present at all events as they occur, in the cities where they take place, and in the places of revolution with people one has met, be he the Spanish hero, Deris, or the comrade of revolution. People and the concentration camps in France — three Whistles from America, two Whistles from Poland, “with the greatest efficiency of pyramid builders and high, red, sausage-like staves shared like those of fallahin,” along with a great number of Russians, “Haflenstein snipers” — or the East Front where under fire.

It is history—historical, not “historiography.” The masses are seen individually as they busy themselves uprising, liberating — even dying. It is this which invests the novel with an excitement that relates to lose any of its force simply because it is “documentary.” Having been a participant in these revolutions, the author himself, Victor Serge, a writer of great talent, knows how to “infiltrate” the history, although the motifs of the traditional novel have been broken down from the very first paragraph, the very first chapter. “This City and Us,” Serge unites not only people and history, but brick and mortar, past and present — with a little touch of the comic.

“A crazy sort of sheer rock, shattering the most beautiful of the revolutionaries’ dreams is the barricade...” — and we are told of rebel arrested in stone, affirmed since the beginning of time...

We would have liked the novel to be a little more realistic, not too far from the real, to have been a little less like a novel and a little more like history. We would have liked the city to be a little more real, to have been a little less like a novel and a little more like a city.

It is not a question of the longer revolution being more or less than the shorter revolution, or the greater the longer. The longer cities, where the longer, more successful, or the greater the longer.

The recognition of each other “by the way...” we had of becoming skilled in the art of seeing things, not only in the books, but in the streets, the people, the places, the times.

Yet there is no reminiscence of the events that followed, not only of the brutality with which the revolt was put down but even of the revenge by the bourgeoisie who murdered the police after the police had murdered the Basque. Nor does Serge attempt to “skip over” the abortive uprising or the feeling that “nothing is ever lost” reappears as an actually in the Russian revolution. But the author seems to have escaped from the law and the torturer who escaped to France escaped, not to freedom, but to a concentration camp. There too, under an epidemic breaks out to drain their number, and each day when they arrive, the question is: who is the next? The old lepers of freedom, the Volsches, the war epi-steeil and “The Big Groan,” the struggle of the Spanish brothers, of the workers of the machine, the innkeepers, the sailors, the trade of those lads who wanted to be “new men.” To be free and democracy, the work of Lenin —is yet unknown to the world — the people in misery.

Idea is the steel arrow which gives them to the utter destruction and, finally, does bring them freedom when the armistice is signed and they are sent back to France in exchange for the French hostages. Even here, even in the moment of triumph upon the arrival in Petrograd, it is not the myth of revolution, but its reality that we face.

We found not the passionate battle going forward under new flags to struggle against each day in tragic and fruitful conflicts, but a sort of vast administration, an army, a machine in which the most burning energies and the clearest of the intellects were hourly integrated and which performed its task successfully. And that task was to remain constant, for common sense, often inept, achievements, with forces which, each day, seemed to be lost; to live and to struggle and to die over the same field. The revolution was an exhausted country, on the verge of falling back into inertia.

In this story there is only the real, the true, final to express it in any language.

The daily labor, the daily struggle, the battle of those who desire to know more than they know. Here they all sit, the survivors of 1917 and 1936, revolution, gathering together in an old castle that they cannot touch but suddenly...

"Old Lenin's joviality returned on the floor of the grand saloon, plunged in darkness. He entered, his arms loaded with heavy, green-velveted bibles with which he went to the sick, with those who had been wounded in the war; he had to be careful to break the lighting bulb in the right place."

The winter on in the face...

"The days are burning!" he said.

The friendly warmth is in front of which the young woman was stretching out her hands from the flames dancing "pente XXVII" of the Collection of the Tragedies of the Capital. For fun, I pulled out a half-finished page, edged with Wholesale, and then...

"To the rights of collateral..."...

"It was only then, after thirty burning hours, that I remembered the letter I had received the previous day; I hurried through this unknown city, over there... all at once to arrive at the place where I was going to sell my basket of fabrics, then to turn toward me, the path of the other man who asked me... "You see that we can take cities! and it's not over yet, and we will find the other"...

This dramatic moment does not, however, and the work, instead: "I submitted these four pages of writing once more, at a glance, and I stumbled upon one line, no different from all the others in the four evenings, which was...

"...ever since they killed our Daro..."

The chronicles of revolutions, the artist who has broken the mold of the novel, even some of the prose that has so far been... all those tribes used to transform the readers into a different life. That is the great achievement of Birth of Our Power. No one, old or young, worker or intellectual, artist, businessman, American or African, Jew or Chinese, should miss this singular opportunity of living or reliving that revolutionary era, which is neither lament nor prophecy but just is...

Detroit, Michigan—June 22, 1937

DEBA DUNAYEVSKAYA
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Instant Vulgar Materialism vs. Marxist Humanism

Editor's Note: The following letter by Enga Kepuropga was sent to the philological journal, Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, in response to a letter by Professor Donald Clark Hodges in "The Young Marx—A Reappraisal." While the journal chose not to print the letter, we feel it is important to publish it for our readers.

Fortunately, Marx's world outlook, which he originally called "theological materialism" and elaborated in a series of manuscripts now called Evidential Materialism Manuscripts, 1844, is now available in several English translations. These translations allow the reader to glimpse into the specifics of "comparative influence" (p.210) before the Humanists essays out of the academic halls and into the historic scene. This was not always the case, even after the Humanist revolution of 1850 and after Marx's death. In 1850, Enga Kepuropga wrote that "the West" learned from Marx, and in his letter of April 1850, Hodges also claimed that "the West" learned from Marx.

Unfortunately, Prof. Hodges didn't find himself to what we might call instant vulgar materialist interpretation of Marx and those who dare to defend the young Marx in the revival of Marx studies, but seemed to be ideologically McCarthy. This must not go unchallenged. Here is what he writes: "It has been a matter of principle for each of the major revivals of Marx studies in this country to claim intellectual independence of the U. S. R. In fact, however, each has been closely allied to corresponding economic and political developments within the Soviet Union." (p.219) And further down on the same page: "As a matter of fact, the Soviet Union seems to have led the way of awakening interest in the young Marx. The first English translation of the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts was published in Moscow in 1906, presumably for foreign consumption. A new Russian edition was published during the same year, testifying to the increasing domestic interest in the work."

FIRST ENGLISH PUBLICATION IN "MARXISM & FREEDOM"

Accidentally or otherwise, 1956, which is given as the date of the allegedly first English publication, in Moscow, would indeed make it the first published version in English. The only trouble with the 1905 date is that it isn't true. While in Moscow there is no problem, and Moscow did not even exist in 1905, I am unable to get a publisher to publish a letter to me who was a student at the University of Chicago in 1947, that I was unable to get a publisher to publish in 1956 when I was a student at the University of Chicago. And to Hodges' claim that "the West" learned from Marx in its early years, I must point out that the first English translation of the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts was published in Moscow in 1906, presumably for foreign consumption. A new Russian edition was published during the same year, testifying to the increasing domestic interest in the work."

In 1956 the major Russian philosophical journal suddenly appeared on the scene. Its name was "Marx's World," and it was a key publication. As if Marx had already established his Humeism, A. V. Karpov, the author of "Marx's World," in a letter to the editor of the journal, "an open letter," in 1956, argued that it was necessary to separate "the revolution of the Russian intelligentsia" from the "revolution of the Russian Marxists." The letter was printed under the title "An open letter" (p.219) and not as much, as Enga Kepuropga thinks, in the name of "open Marxism" (which means revolution), but rather among the intelligentsia, especially among Marxists. This was then unable to convince anybody in academia that the Russian declaration of an open so-called criticism of the young Marx was anything but "furthest splitting."
Editorial
Che Guevara, Revolutionary

Che Guevara has joined the rank of immortal martyrs. What makes his martyrdom unique is that he was not a remain part of the new state power, as some have claimed. He had been a leader of the successful revolution in Cuba. He gave himself as host of the guerrilla movement and embarked on the footsteps of guerrilla fighters in a still another country, Bolivia.

The death of Bolivia, the home of the U.S.-trained and-led Bolivian forces was a case of outright murder. He had been wounded and murdered by a fate of U.S. armed and automatic rifled. He was the son of from Quirino del Toro, who had been assassinated by the Bolivian army. While the Bolivian army was asked what to do of him, the Bolivian army had no official death penalty. Che was executed within two hours of arrival in Misiones. Seven bullet holes were clearly visible, including one through the heart, administered after he became a prisoner. The Bolivian army, as the official story goes, the Bolivian army by the Argentinian junta. His body, stripped to a helmet, was then taken to Valle Grande and taken to a Catholic hospital where the body was put on public exhibition.

So afraid was the Bolivian military of even the dead Guerier that, though it was against all custom in Catholic Bolivia, his body was nevertheless cremated. Even that didn’t end the massacre ritual. As if it would stop Che from becoming a beacon for all Latin American struggling for freedom from their own oligarchy and U.S. Imperialism, they then scattered his ashes to the wind.

In vain are all these frantic efforts to erase the memory of the revolutionary martyr. Peru, a nation in the dimen that, with its revolutionary martyr, Peru, can no longer be understood as a model for the Latin American struggle for freedom from their own oligarchy and U.S. Imperialism, they have abandoned the battle against the regime.

It is the Bolivian junta that has been able to rid itself of a military junta after the end of the Bolivian war, but they found that it is far more to the benefit of the country’s economy. It is the Bolivian junta that Che’s fight has highlighted.

To prepare themselves for the upsurge on two fronts it becomes necessary to have a clear and direct, to say, a revolutionary strategy, fully integrated with the self-interest of the masses, and to see that we must not blind ourselves to the double tragedy of Che Guevara’s death, but that we too have to rid Bolivia of what he had done in Cuba: relate himself to the masses.

SOCIAL REVOLUTION AND GUERRILLA WAR
Guevara’s isolation from the mass movement arises from a certain concept of guerrilla warfare as an alternative to social revolution. The similarity with the masses who do not rise at the call of the guerrilla leaders, the opposition to the party, which Che has called “socialist revolutionaries and rulers’ the scorn for theory—

The Bolivian junta has been able to drift on two fronts it becomes necessary to have a clear and direct, to say, a revolutionary strategy, fully integrated with the self-interest of the masses, and to see that we must not blind ourselves to the double tragedy of Che Guevara’s death, but that we too have to rid Bolivia of what he had done in Cuba: relate himself to the masses.

The Bolivian junta has been able to drift on two fronts it becomes necessary to have a clear and direct, to say, a revolutionary strategy, fully integrated with the self-interest of the masses, and to see that we must not blind ourselves to the double tragedy of Che Guevara’s death, but that we too have to rid Bolivia of what he had done in Cuba: relate himself to the masses.
TWO WORLDS

By Roya Donayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom

Black Mass Revolt: Where to Now?

Because of the importance of BLACK MASS REVOLT, which has just been published by News & Letters Committees, I am turning over my column space this time to reprint excerpts from the last chapter, "Where to Now?"—News & Letters.

The whole point against slavery is to get rid of the power structure, that is to say, the capitalist class system. Without tearing that out by its root, no freedom is possible. Torn down will not do. That must go. Far from creating jobs for the masses, or ridering the slave of it, they are taking away the mass of them, or sowing the poor black man's children to the universality from which one may reach Congress, the Senate and the Supreme Court, but just press up the status quo, "the system".

Too many of the leaders who talk about black power mean only a semblance of it as if that would change the system. They talk about being the majority, or promise they "soon will be", in the cities. But the masses from South, where they are the majority, know that voting doesn't change anything very much. It isn't only that white chauvinism out of their majority—no, they don't operate even when the blacks do some vote. But the greater truth still is this: so long as the "boss and black" relationship remains, no vote can change their conditions of life.

SO OVERPOWERING is that relationship of "boss to black" that when the New Deal first came about, even the federal power had to bow to it. And it is even more true now that "reform" mechanism—Automation—has taken over. Just consider the single fact that over in the state of Mississippi in the 27 counties where most of the cotton is grown, no less than 75 percent of all cotton picking is done not by humans, but by machines. It is in the heart of the South, in the places where the Negro is still the majority, where there is actual revolution, actual and mortality of a different than the rest. Because every village is an actual revolution, every village to a Negro is Lawrence County, Alabama, or the Mississippi Delta.

It drives the masses from the farms to the cities in the South as well as the North. But, though there is 65 per cent urbanization among Negroes, this is possible only as unemployment follows the Negro wherever he goes. Of course, they have certain power, as the result of the cities have, but, unless not is artificially placed to industry, one cannot stop its wheels from turning and thus stop capitalism in its tracks.

TO GIVE ANOTHER impression by claiming that the organization of the South is equivalent to the organization in the factories is only to say disastrous illusions. The masses are right to reject these illusions, and, instead, try to find some solidarity with white labor—the white rank and file workers who do oppose management. Not only are they involved throughout the country in this struggle together, but the black workers are right to use this as the reason for not isolating themselves from the white workers by lumping them to the same category as the white who is low.

Nor are they about to accept a Sunday sermon in a "philosophy of history". Just as black nationalism has been a class natural growth from Negroes to unite and meet the situation as that naturally is, so will not mean tearing the system up by its roots unless it means mass power, working class power. This is what a black worker meant when he said, "I like to fight to power life in history."

IF IT WILL NOT do to speak of a "philosophy of history" as if that, to use an expression of Marx, is nothing more than the "revolutionary motive" of the intellectual's own head, Unless the philosophy arises out of a historic movement of masses struggling for total freedom, and the whole world is in its stage, it can neither answer the urgency of our life and times, nor bear the seeds of the future forward movement of humanity. Because the Communists understand this (not only in part), they are trying to associate "black power" with the struggle of the "third world". The advantage there is that this means the following of the blackness, which are many oppressed whites, yellow, and whatever other color the human is.

The trouble is that this "third world" that is being associated with "black power" seems to be only that part of it which follows the "Communist line"—and that only at the moment when it is not revolutionary but more racist than the nationalism or internationalism. At the same time, Carnacdes is in such a dilemma with the "bourgeois to revolution" (guerrilla warfare) that he doesn't even realize that, instead of a loaf, he is holding on to a short circuit, but the realization in America is not good to short circuit itself before it has ever gained sufficient momentum to achieve the goal of total freedom.

THE ADVANTAGE of all the talk of black power is its own dynamism, the fact that it is altogether too late now to turn it back to a talk among "leaders". What some call the civil rights demonstrations, and others call the fatal division between the black nationalist movement, as of News & Letters Committees, as the organization of mass thought by the masses themselves. Now, the substitute for this self-organization of thought, anymore than there is a substitute for the self-organization of the masses. The task is too large, too vital, to be left to intellectuals, or even to a "central organization".

But no Great Wall separate spontaneously from organization. They, too, are related—some is thought to be. Any separation of one from the other would be fatal. The unifying cement for the two is the type of organization which, includes the organization of one's thought. That task, too, cannot be achieved without you. We invite you to join us as the hard road to total freedom.

NOV., 1967
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EDITORIAL

THE MOUSE THAT LOARED

On May 20, at his 10th-anniversary news conference after he
returned to power in 1962 and mobilized the French Republic
to his authoritarian demands, de Gaulle, the head of a technologi-
cally advanced, rich, in history and culture, strategically
situated at the very heart of Western Europe, began his well-
planned, eloquent diatribe against "the outside element, artifi-
cial and unilateral, weighing on our prosperity." From his cal-
culated, Olympian height, he seemed almost to defy the
American dollar andathom the line of metal, "the immobility,
the immobility and the universality that are characteristics of
gold" and revived "even to negotiability" England's entry into the
Common Market.

Above the din of de Gaulle's exhortations to turn back both the
American "invasion" of the West European economy, and the
British "degradation" that would "sell the ship for the commu-
nity," could be heard the moan of "the voice of France went
abroad" in Israel. He failed to take note, however, of the fact
that on that question "the voice went unheard," not only in Isra-
el but everywhere, including, above all, among the French
government and people themselves. Just as they opposed the General's following the
Russian resolution reiterating the Arab line on the Arab-Israeli
war in June, so now they detected an underlying anti-Semitism in
his description of the Jewish people as an "enlightened...rose
dish, democratizing."

But the full extent from the sordidly of challenging Ameri
can hegemony in the world affairs to the headline-busting attempt
to detach Quebec from Canada became manifest as the clarion
call for "independence" began to sound imperiously potential.
He promised "the submergence of peasant" (at Expo '67) that France
would never again "abandon her children."

No wonder people refused to take the mouse that scared for
a horse.

GOLD AND THE STATE PLAN

De Gaulle should, however, be believed when he says it
was not France that caused the pressure on the gold market.
First, France doesn't have the gold with which to challenge
the American bulwark. In the Paris Bank. The French gold even
seriously upset the British pound as it contributed only one
percent of the gold. As against the $700 million the pool was to have
left Britain to back up the failure. But there's the "gold" that is the
goldiers that have the red Ruilin to shake the world, the
Middle East potentates and the extremely wealthy from West
and East and South, and spreading the greedy American "free enter-
priser" who hoped to make a killing if they could compete
the American market and we avoided the nuclear war that is
due more to "big capital eating little capital" (to use Marx's
expression) than to technological superiority.

Above all, the American private investors are totally irrespon-
sible both in their disregard of the national state plans and the
state of employment and unemployment.

It isn't that de Gaulle's heart bleeds for the workers, employed
or unemployed. His success in bringing "order" into the French
economy when he returned to power was due to drastic depaup-
dation of the franc plus a substantial reduction in real wages. But
European capital has learned that the more affluent American
capital keeps forgetting. The State Plan—in France it is called
"the economic plan" and in the United States "the growth of
the unemployed army "manageable," and the "international cartel"
forced to show some responsibility to the "capital" rather than
indulging in a race to the bottom of the gold market. That's the
 Americanc行情

THE AMERICAN BEHEMMOTI

In 1958 he rediscovered gold. He then found that if France
control the gold reserves held in gold, he can exert a pressure upon
American gold reserves and hence the whole economy. His attack
on American capitalism helped USSR do what he was unable to
do previously—get them to voluntarily restrict their flight of
dollars abroad in search of higher rates and cheaper labor—
while de Gaulle's "partners" in the Common Market lapped at
the chance to seize the limited American investments to their
countries instead of to France. And since it is America, not France,
that has the bulk of the dollars, the Behemoth, American capital, didn't
make one move either for the State Plan or for the world market.

Because de Gaulle's France had automated its industries, and
varied its capital, satisfied its plan and, through the Common
Market, at last been bled out of its monopoly, de Gaulle is
under the delusion that he can change the hard facts of the post-
war world that in place of the several big powers that divided
the world between themselves, two, and only two super-powers
— and Russia—continued to dominate the world, and his boast
inAndreou's book that he can dominate the world in the Communist
world, for the French to continue to dominate America's
NATO world.

Because the American economy in the late '50s was stagnant
while the European economy was booming, de Gaulle thought
that he could "move" to European powers they "superiority of
the American Behemoth" Toward that end he first tried creating a new world axis—Paris-Buchin—and
finally to take over the American dollar. His
was to undermine Russia's predominance in the Communist
world, and in the world to dominate America's
NATO world.

But between 1965 and 1967 the BJF escalated the Vietnam
war and with it came war contracts, swelling profits attractive enough for greedy American "free enter-
priisers" to expand plant equipment in America, and the American economy was again
took off. By 1967, his megalomania was the "Third Force." He let his imagination run wild as he slammed the Middle East war.
He thereby opened the way that would not be solved by the appearance of the
little, but not as 

The Behemoth, American, capitalism, will not move so long
and the militarization of the American economy set, with its
$20 billion annually on the Vietnam war (as against the mere pittance of $200 million as America's "contribution" to Arab development") It is upon this, and not upon West European
capital, that the American Behemoth builds itself. This is the
dead, the animo, the speculation on the land, the savagery
and barbarism of modern warfare.

THE MILITARIZATION OF THE WORLD ECONOMY

It is not de Gaulle, who is himself a participant in the militar-
ization of the world economy, who, excepting the
no country in the world, be it France or China, the Middle
East or East or North, not to mention America, that doesn't spend inap-
sorite sums on the militarization of the economy, including "The Beaulieu," he's it of other pressure on the countries far dropped from outer space like Russia.

The world is not completely over $20 billion annually toward these destructive purposes. For this the U.S. alone is spend-
ing $79 billion. In the two decades since the end of the World War II, the U.S. has spent on less than $5 billion for what it

describes as "defence." And this is the time when there were no
"major wars" and we avoided the nuclear war that is
due more to "big capital eating little capital" (to use Marx's
expression) than to technological superiority.

De Gaulle has discovered the Achilles heel of the super-
powers—that all the contradictions are through his power politics. The
super power becomes the most hated throughout the whole. But
though the General thinks he has found a secret to it. In truth he himself has become valuable, if not the
beau then in the heart. If he is intellectualized, strategic position, has led him to play for the highest stakes, and
he thinks he can make the old and new superpowers according to his streng.
to his time, and does not, and will not.

Therefore the crisis is in need of its root, first in the point of pro-
duction, and these human relations with exploitive capital extend
over these points of production, when production in the 
working people alone can destroy it at its root. No one else will,
not only because they themselves have vested interests but also
because there is no energy source on earth including atomic, can sub-
stitute for the ever-increasing forces of the enthusiasm of people best
for America's unity. Far from it. It has been created third world performed miracles in warring political-free-
dom and then went after the American folks with the workers
and youth in the technologically advanced countries, move to total freedom.
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Nigerian: A Retreat, Not A Victory

The following is a letter, published on 18 March 1958, to the editors of the New York Review of Books by a Nigerian nationalist, in response to a recent article.

Conrad O'Brien's article in the New York Review of Books was one of the most brilliant articles on Nigerian politics that I have ever read. It was published on 12 July 1957, and it was a response to a piece by R. A. Butler, who had written about the British Empire and the need for an independent Nigeria.

O'Brien's article was a marked departure from the usual British imperialist propaganda. He argued that the British had made a mistake in supporting the idea of a united Nigeria. He pointed out that the British had not taken into account the diversity of the Nigerian people, and that the idea of a single, unified Nigeria was not realistic.

O'Brien's article was a wake-up call for the British government. It forced them to reconsider their policy towards Nigeria. The British government eventually announced its intention to grant Nigeria independence, and this was a significant moment in the history of Nigeria.

The British government's decision to grant Nigeria independence was a turning point in the fight for Nigerian independence. It was a recognition of the aspirations of the Nigerian people, and it paved the way for the eventual independence of Nigeria in 1960.

Although Nigeria did not achieve its independence immediately, the British government's decision to grant it independence was a significant step forward. It was a recognition of the aspirations of the Nigerian people, and it paved the way for the eventual independence of Nigeria in 1960.

The Nigerian government was able to build on the foundation laid by the British government and to create a stable and prosperous nation. This was a testament to the resilience of the Nigerian people and their determination to achieve their dreams.

In conclusion, O'Brien's article was a significant contribution to the debate on Nigerian politics. It was a wake-up call for the British government and a recognition of the aspirations of the Nigerian people. It was a significant step forward on the road to Nigerian independence.
US Bombs Devastate South Vietnam
As Civil War Rages in the Cities

By Roy Donagysky, National Chairman
News & Letter Committees

Civil war is raging in South Vietnam. From the inception of the recent military offensive against the Vietcong’sា it is clear that the Vietcong has the sympathy and (sometime the full collaboration) of the people as a whole. It would otherwise have been impossible for the Vietcong to infiltrate into the capital, Saigon, spread through the length and breadth of the country, and raise its flag over Hoa, the cultural center of the Buddhist and student opposition to the corrupt militarist regime of Generals Thieu and Ky who choose to wear the civilian clothes of President and Vice-president. Moreover, the Vietcong achieved these spectacular successes with minimal power he powerless to stop black marketeering, decree rationing so that all are at least assured the bare necessities of life! And the answer is just as inexplicable. This governmental clique represents nobody but itself.

GROSS CORRUPTION

The rampant corruption didn’t suddenly break out on the day of battle. For years now the Thieu-Ky regime has lived by pockets with as much as 70 per cent of the $30 million the U.S. sent South Vietnam for “reconstruction programs,” has dispensed jobs of power by a price, has sold military deferments, had its wrath aroused only when the workers demanded a 12 per cent increase in wages to counteract chronic inflation.

It is the action of these scoundrels that explains why, whatever terrorist acts the Vietcong may have committed, it is the Government, not Vietcong, harboring which prejudices “government” for either the Thieu-Ky clique or its U.S. sponsors.

MONARMA ARMS LIBERATION

Three days after the Vietnamese started its mass demonstrations against the depatriation of the Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, made his annual and final report to the Congress. Although his report was concerned with Big Power policies—how destructive and immoral are the stockpiles of hydrogen and missiles of U.S. vs. Russia—McNamara did not even make time out to appeal to us about the situation in South Vietnam. So overwhelmed by the demands of Congress to his former “white boy” that, even as the handle dropped, news of the wide acceptance of the Vietcong by the people. Many radio stations continued to repeat the Big Lie of the success of the pacification program.

It appears that the computer-based data of the Administration had a new, “more advanced standard of measurement” by which to index the success of the “people”
tation program. It is caused by the "war of attrition" which went into effect early in 1967; 1968, because it is more then 80 percent of the people of South Vietnam live under allied military protection.

The road to freedom is still long, and the road to democracy is still long. The road to development is still long. The road to peace is still long. The road to justice is still long. The road to prosperity is still long.

The road to freedom is still long, and the road to democracy is still long. The road to development is still long. The road to peace is still long. The road to justice is still long. The road to prosperity is still long.

The road to freedom is still long, and the road to democracy is still long. The road to development is still long. The road to peace is still long. The road to justice is still long. The road to prosperity is still long.

The road to freedom is still long, and the road to democracy is still long. The road to development is still long. The road to peace is still long. The road to justice is still long. The road to prosperity is still long.

The road to freedom is still long, and the road to democracy is still long. The road to development is still long. The road to peace is still long. The road to justice is still long. The road to prosperity is still long.
MARCH, 1968
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Shortcut To Revolution
Or Long Road To Tragedy?

Revolution In The Revolution?
by Rejiq Debray, Grove Press, N.Y., 55c.

Jean-Paul Sartre was so impressed with Rejiq Debray’s treatise that when the author was arrested in Bolivia, Sartre held that the reason behind the arrest was not any alleged political activity, but the publication of a book which “removes all the brakes from guerrilla activities.” Some years later, Debray’s arrest, followed by the brutal murder of Che Guevara by the Bolivian military junta, the Cuban government, and no less than 200,000 copies of Revolution in the Revolution? printed of the original Spanish edition. Since then it has undergone many translations and has become a best-seller for all would-be Cuban type guerrilla fighters. The young French philosopher, in fact, finds the author or, and, very distinctly, Castro considers this book an accurate presentation of his views.

Insurrection or Revolution?

Nevertheless, the very title of the book is quite deceptive. This is not a book about revolution either "as such" or "within." The Russian Revolution of 1917 is, for example, never even referred to as a revolution, but is called the "insurrection." Nor can the reader find a single word in the book that would inform him that that "insurrection" was the last, not the first, act of revolution, whose spontaneity as well as organisation, dialectic of subjective events as well as of theory, self-development of millions of people tearing the old society up by its roots in general strikes and battles of ideas, its anti-war struggle, and in two revolutions, led all to the success of the insurrection.

Instead, spontaneously as well as organisation—by the mass type like the Paris Commune or the “Paris” type—objectivity as well as theory seem to be dirty words. In their place we get the glorification of one, and only one, activity, guerrilla war.

But here, too, there is deception. Glorification of guerrilla warfare encompasses only Latin America (actually only Cuba). Upon it alone “the irony of history has wilted… this vanguard role” it alone has earned a “true style of leadership.” The leaders of all other guerrilla wars, including, the Vietnamese, are consigned to “the past.” The book bears with missionary zeal "to free the present from the past.

The Poor Dialectic!

A greater deception than either that contained in the title of the book or in the alleged surrendering of the “terrain” of guerrilla war to Latin America, underlies the contention that, as against the abstractions of theory, this essay is based solely on “experience,” facts, “the concrete.”

As if a phrase like “the irony of history” was no more than the latest cigarette equivalent — "Save me, I don’t know why. I taste just never quite.” — Debray continues to sing the praises of details, especially military details. “Everything is a matter of detail,” said Fidel. Under the guise of this orthodoxy, the most pretentious theoretical declarations are asserted which indeed change the course, not of details, but of theory and fact, history and “a new dialectic” of tasks. Delineating this “new dialectic” is the need to set up “military forces, not political forces.” Poor dialectic, what crimes have not been committed in thy name!

“We supposed, further, to extend the priority of the military over the political party to the point where it substitutes itself for theory. Indeed, it is superior since it is contemporary and freed from such things as “the past” as Marx’s theory of world revolution as "elemental dialectic," as "theology of the future." The authors do not mention "historical orthodoxy" which might recall that the French of the dialectics of life mean a second negation, or total reorganisation of both reality and theory. According to Debray, even in the glorified field of guerrilla war, “theory does as much harm as good”.

“One may well consider it a stroke of good luck that Fidel had not seen any military writings until then. Embarking before disembarking on the coast of Oriente, he could thus invent, on the spot and out of his own experience, principles of a military doctrine in conformity with the terrain.”

Moreover, the “new dialectic of tasks” demands that physical fitness tower above “a perfect (clue) Marxist education” work above open propaganda, new dubbed “armed propaganda,” which is not only subordinated to the military, but military till even after power when it “facilitates the organisation of production, the collection of taxes, the interpretation of revolutionary laws, the maintenance of discipline”.

The Poor Peasant and the Leader Maximum

Debray is as completely unconscious as to the catastrophic character of the concept he had just uttered as he was of the intellectual petty-bourgeois concept of the “backwardness” of the masses that he gave vent in when he stressed the need of being recruiting around the peasant; “the poor peasant believes, first of all, in anyone who has a car.” In the words of the guerilla song, the “badass of the people’s police, or nowadays the Green Berets” and Ranger, enjoy a progress of the greater for being such.

It is very, the poor peasant can be saved in only one way by guerrilla warfare carried out by small guerrilla bands irrespective of the policies either of the objective or the subjective situations. Instead of these dead-end streets, there is a “shock”: it is the duty of revolutionaries to create revolutions. As for the poor peasant, well, “Guerrilla warfare is in peasant uprisings what bread is to sorrow.” Nothing lost.

As against the trusting peasant, the French philosopher shows his independence of authority by pointing out the duality of politics and the military symbolised by Mao Tse-tung and Chi Tse (to Chi Minh and Giap: "Perhaps we could add Lewis and Trotsky") (11) but, glory be, “In Cuba, military (operational) and political leadership have been combined in one man, Fidel Castro.” Thus, with the help of a purported statement by Che, Debray reaches for the Leader Maximum.

"The guerrilla force, if it genuinely seeks total political warfare, cannot in the long run ignore any fundamental duality of functions or power. Che Guevara carries the idea of unity as far as he goes, that the military and political nature of the revolution—struggles in America can be united, if possible, in one person…”

Here we have three highly the perspectives, medieval Germany, much less dared critique his closest collaborator, Egri, for “paying too much attention to military affairs” in the Civil War in the U.S. If only he had lived to learn the art of guerrilla warfare he would have seen how much easier it is to attack followers as opposed a bolivian occultist than the theory of imperialist revolution, especially if one does not himself have the slightest notion of the Marxist philosophy of liberation.

So dominated by the concept of the single leader maximum is Debray that he projects it on an international level and has faith in the future: "When Comrades Che Guevara once again took up insurrectional work, he accepted an international level the same as the political level of the action of which Fidel Castro, the leader of the Cuban Revolution, is the hero." When Che Guevara reappears, it is hardly risky to assert that it will be as head of a guerrilla movement, as its unquestioned political and military leader.

(To be continued in the next issue)

(11) This blinding of Latin and Trotsky is, unfortunately, asserted, not in order to set the latter up as a standard to be aimed at, but to write with India, merely to play the proper role of "objectivity" as the author launches into a typical Stalinistic diatribe: "Let us for the moment decide to take the Trotskyite revolution seriously, and not as the pure and simple opposition that it is in practice… we have been told that Trotsky is ultra-leftists. Nothing is further from us that truth. Trotskyism and Leninism is condemning guerrilla warfare, is barking or sabotaging it." Although "the art of insurrection" had been Trotsky’s strongest point as well as praxis and thesorexism, the Trotskyist epithets not only did not rise to the defense of Trotsky, but in their high praise of Debray’s book, more then once mentioned that it contained these slanderes. (See The World Today, The administrative mentality of those who think for power leads naturally in the practice of strange politicies, open clash of ideas in both cases—Debray as a Castro and The Militant reviewer as a Trotskyist—the style is truly the man.)
Editorial Article

These Uncivilized United States: Murder of Rev. King, Vietnam War

by Raya Dunayevskaya, Chairman News & Letters Committees

The lunar landing began in spring this year with so fast-moving a scenario that neither the startling judicature of LBJ nor his loaded "peace feelers," hot time to sink in before the shot that killed Dr. King reverberated around the world. LBJ's popularity fell late Sunday night with his announcement of the ceasefire of the Vietnam war plummeted down with the news of King's assassination on Thursday, April 4.

No serious commentator abroad thought this was an act of a single individual. Instant, or just filled with hatred. Every one took a second look at this racist land where acts of conspiracy to commit murder "and get away with it" are spaced out of an atmosphere emanating from a White House conducting a barbaric war abroad, and a Congress which allows its "illustrious members" to sound like rednecks bent on murder.

The latest act of barbarity had already been revealed by LBJ's exposure of LBJ's retreat from the promise "to go anywhere anytime to talk peace." The cautious act of murder had already inspired a neo-Neo to attempt duplicitating the act by shooting a school student leader in West Germany. (See article, col. 3.)

POVERTY VS. AFFLUENCE

Though all the "dictatorships" were duly represented at King's funeral, the difference between the podium and pagentry of the funeral of the assassinated president five years ago and the present media coverage leaving the body of Dr. King was stark. This was not only due to the difference between a president and a "civilian" but it was just the difference between a rich man and a poor one; or, King wasn't all that poor. He had chosen the all-white cars of the President and these unincorporated United States of America. The murder of Dr. King shocked even the Vietnam war off the front pages of the papers as black revolts struck out in no less than 125 cities, most of them unreported in the previous hot summers.

The very facts of American civilization were unraveling so that its racist mind was no good for all the world to see. When "law and order" was restored, neither which had been late nor will ever be.

Another LBJ finally flew off to Seoul to meet his reactionary South Korean cohorts in war, so one cared any longer to listen.

The true measure of both the grief and internecination to go on with the civil war for freedom was seen, in one form, in the mass outpouring of 150,000 who were in Atlanta, and, in another form, in the black revolts in the cities.

SELF-STYLE REVOLUTIONARIES

Enter the self-styled "revolutionaries" with their degeneration of the role of Dr. King and the Movement. It is the opposite side of the hypercritical mentalism of the Administration. Parroting the talk of the white power structure, they contort King's life with his stand on non-violence. That's not why Rev. King was subjected to 500 jailing. It isn't why he extended the most militant attack from Congress. And it isn't why he was marked for assassination.

On April 4th, when Rev. King's body was still lying in state, we saw self-styled revolutionaries. --William Eubank, rose to speak in a committee meeting of some 200 mostly white CSNY students. Just because he was a black man, he had the gall to speak as if he represented the black community as he yelled -- "We don't mourn King, we saw King as an obstacle in the black liberation movement."

Outside of the inhumanity of such a statement about one man who was thrust down at the age of 39, having given his whole adult life to the Movement, the misunderstanding of the history of the black liberation struggle is self-evident when one considers that the King was murdered because he came down to Memphis to assist black workers locked in their own struggle, with the white power structure.

But this isn't a criticism only of the past, either that of one man or of the Movement. Rather, it is a question of perspective of future development, and in not
not only to see the record straight, but what is also so important is to see that the objective movement of history itself, replaced by petit-bourgeois subjectivism, is replaced by the fact of a crusade carried on by the community itself, a crusade carried on by a William Ryan, or more subtly in a vanguard church by Rev. King. Any voluntarist approach cannot but have tragic consequences for the American revolution that is yet to develop.

VOICES FROM BELOW: 1955-66

In retrospect, the entrenchment of Reverend King, however great a leader of the Montgomery bus boycott with the totally new stage of Negro revolt appears, not as accidental, but the right person at the right place at the right time. That is to say, it expresses the objective significance of Rev. King’s role in that struggle, sparked by the refusal of a Negro vanguard, Rosa Parks, to give up her seat on the bus to a white man.

We didn’t need the lapse of a decade before we sensed the historic significance of “the Freeman’s call” or the Alabama Negroes who had the potential to go all the way to the bone. At the very moment of its happenings we compared the significance of the Montgomery boycott to the white power structure in Alabama to the Hungarian Revolution against the Hungarian Communist, stressing that “the greatest thing of all in the Montgomery, Alabama, spontaneous organization was its spontaneity.”

But let us add here that it was not that Rev. King came there. It is that he knew how to listen to the voices from below and, therefore, to represent them in a boycott that lasted 382 long days during which it was in mass assembly some three times a week, daily registered its own transport, moving forward in a struggle against the forces of all-out resistance, a demand for biracial Negro bus drivers.

If there were those who hadn’t registered this totally new stage of Negro revolt in 1955, none failed to see, on the one hand, the barbershop of Duff Counter’s police dogs, water hoses, electric cattle prods, and, on the other hand, the bravery, daring, and indomitable resistance of the Negroes in Birmingham in 1963.

Again King was there. This time he tried also to give philosophic expression to the struggle against segregation. In his famous letter from a Birmingham jail to the white community, he objected to “illegal acts,” Rev.

King wrote: “We can never forget that everything that Hitler did in Germany was legal and everything the Hungarian Freedom Fighters did in Hungary was illegal.” To see the words of Martin Luther, the great Jewish philosopher, segregator who was an 18th-century relationship for the 19th-century relationship and ends up reflecting reasons to the states of things.

Both nationally and internationally, both in relationship to the non-violent centers here and the more violent phases of the African revolutions. Dr. King had developed to the point where he was not only standing in the way of the struggle for freedom.

Though the hemorrhage philosophy he then adopted was quoted from Luther, and not Marx, he was no more aware that the African Revolutions based themselves on the Humanism of Marx.

HUMANISM

It is true that, by 1955, Rev. King faltered seriously as he was completely baffled by the newer stage of Negro revolt in Houston and Watts and all the other downtown, but “commonly marked by the shouts of ‘Burn, baby, burn!’ But the Detroit phase from the Negro masses at that moment was not as serious as the King’s present in providing non-violence.

Those leaders who widen a printshop, the leaders of the committee, were just as far removed from the actual Black revolt in the Northern cities as were those like King who persisted in providing non-violence.

For something a great deal more significant than the Whips vs. non-violence was involved in the Negroes were seized. A new comprehensive view among black and white labor and other white revolutionaries to help in the ‘cultural’ work of the New Left.

New leaders did arise, but they traveled everywhere from Caledon to Algiers. They were not where mass power lay on the streets. They were not working out a new relationship of mass power structure on the basis of it and hence could not draw experiences from the new in the masses.

1967: THE VIETNAM WAR AND THE DEATH OF CHANCE

The death of chance with the Vietnam war on the scene of the youth, both white and black, at least got out little resistance from Rev. King. However, there was no doubt that the dream the young had of achieving equality for Negroes had turned into a nightmare as he moved North and come up against the mightier white power structure there in the person of Chicago city boss, Mayor Daley.

At the same time, the white youth that had gone South to help in the civil rights struggle, and had been, since 1965, shifted to creating an anti-war movement to assert its power and demand of the barbaric imperialist war.

Many a battle of the earlier fight – civil rights as well as war – was as well as days of protest on an international scale – had been applied to those in the present struggle which they saw as critical both to their lives and to the movement’s struggle against poverty. With $22 billion being used in the Vietnam war, the Administration’s “Great Society” was the forgotten black wall left both homes and starting in the black nearest to the ghettos of the North.

Clearly, without a new unifying philosophy of liberation, that would relate itself to the new reality, it was impossible to move forward. The new voice of the revolt in the North as well as Virginia and Mississippi that had not been heard in 1963 were finally heard to say “Hell on us, we won’t get.”

UNITING MOVEMENTS

Dr. King was not against the war and tried uniting the two movements fighting the Administration. At once, he became the target of the most slanderous campaigns which showed also his arrangement in killing him to keep off either than the Negro problems. In this, the Administration was aided by the leadership of the NAACP and Urban League. Gone was any pretense to black unity. Gone was “aggression” of King as a man of acts.

ARMS OF THE KING IN MONTGOMERY, 1955;
new black mass revolt. Some perspective were needed. A new comprehensive view among black and white labor and other white revolutionaries to help in the ‘cultural’ work of the New Left.
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violence. The deep freeze against "the war on poverty" was no longer sustained to Southern bastions but was the dominating line of the Presidency.

It is this atmosphere of capitalistic monopolists that Rev. King confronted as he planned what became his last and greatest battle to combine the poor — black and white, Indian and Mexican-American — in a massive march on Washington that would not only continue with the days of protest against the Vietnam war, but also promised to continue till the whole white power structure was disrupted; civil disobedience that would peacefully revolutionize society by masses in motion. Thereby Dr. King courted death.

It was not King who was the "revolutionary" to black liberation. It was the capitalistic system. The "guerilla" had far less a revolutionary perspective with their smaller goals and skilled concepts. Whether the march would have developed to keep King's moving, to bring "orderly" government to a halt; it is impossible now to say. What is clear is that the threat of the march kept the Administration on its toes.

All sorts of "new politics," too, were brought in to bring pressure upon King to direct the movement into electoral channels — and he seemed to begin to think in those terms himself.

BLACK AND WHITE

But all was still in flux. Masses were in motion if not in the Movement; white labor was forced to help black labor at least on specific issues. And not only with finances but a promise to bring "thousands" to Memphis. The atmosphere was charged further or it became clear that President Johnson, while declaring for de-escalation, had in fact embarked on the greatest escalation, although within a more "restricted" area.

The civilians who died were not all in Vietnam. One was gunned down in Memphis and 46 more were killed, 2,200 injured and 21,729 arrested in the week of black revolt that followed King's assassination.

It is true that all that Dr. King had achieved through the years was hot prologue. But it is prologue to a drama of liberation that is unfolding daily. His greatness lay in recognizing the objective movement of history and aligning himself with it. Precisely because it was both objective and had masses in motion, it is sure to continue on a high historical level till society is reconstructed from the bottom up.

May 1968
Who Arrested the French Revolution?

De Gaulle's embrace of the OAS fascist generals as co-leaders in the counter-revolution against the stirings of the French masses—workers, students, and the average man in the street who attempted to reconstruct French society—should have surprised no one. It most certainly didn't surprise U.S. imperialism that so clearly understood its class nature that it rushed to the defence of the ruling classes. Conscious of the threat to the whole "Western system" that a successful French Revolution would have represented, de Gaulle's arrogance and persistent backlining at the US was a minor enough irritant.

In face of the naked fascist sleaz—"Cohn-Bendit is Fxakot"—
all the ideologues of the ruling classes, including the Communists, came out against "the Fascists" and stood ready to defend "law and order"—the Gaullist democracy (detestable!)

Why, then, didn't the class nature of Communists become as evident to the Left, especially to the Trotskyists? Why, although from the start, the Communist attacks on the Trotskyists (who were among the most militant fighters in reaching for workers' power) was unabashed, did the Trotskyists continue to behave as if it were mere questions of "tactics"? Why, above all, do Trotskyists continue to distinguish between "the bourgeois order" and the "Communist"? There are not pedantic questions. The Trotskyists will be among the first to suffer from the reaction. Already they are listed among the organizations to be banned. Yet they are more in continuous to behave as they have for the past three decades and end up as the left face of Communism.

Knowing this, the Communist feared nothing from the exposure of the fact that Preniers Pommiers had regular contacts with the CP leaders throughout the revolutionary situation. Openly enough, through their contact of the CFTC, they did their best to contain the revolt, keep it from uniting with the students who had inspired it, and easily switched to the electoral field and narrow trade unionism, not to mention their role as protagonists for defense of the "Three decades here, those played for France as the Anarchists and the Trotskyists were still helping the fascists and the Spanish revolution was being destroyed."

History is about to repeat itself. Communists feel confident that the worst is yet to come from the Trotskyists. What they do stand in mortal fear of is power in the streets, spontaneous independent proletariat power which would breed the state-capitalism line of style Communism. It is this, just this, Communists feel to destroy. It is this, just this, that de Gaulle appreciates so.

The fear is this, just this, that permits him his two faces: OAS and CP.

To all this Trotskyism remains deaf, dumb, and blind, not because it does not know Communism's "history," but because it cannot comprehend its class nature. Because it is this which arrests it irreversibly; it is this which we must turn.

STATE-CAPITALISM AND THE TROTSKYS:

The first Trotskyist denial that Russia has become a state-capitalist society was that, on the face that, though "capitalism betrayed the Russian Revolution," its result—nationalized property, "abolition and, therefore, the "vanguardist" state—degenerate" enough to be tied to a Stalin-Stalinist Pact, had to be "defended."

The second denial floated that Communism was no more than a euphemism for state-capitalism concerned East Europe where Stalinism reigned. Communists treated, not via a social revolution from below, but via a bureaucratic Party from above, propped into state power with the aid of a "Red Army." Again, though "open struggle and even though the Hungarian Revolution opened up the entire new page in world revolution, and, in pools of blood, proved it wanted freedom from Communism (its Party as well as its secret police), wanted freedom to establish genuine worker councils, the Workers Councils, still the Trotskyists kept insisting that it was "impossible" to have a revolution unless there was a "vanguard Party to lead it."

Then the Third World was born without the aid of any of the shibboleths of Communism—stabilized property, or the "Party," Red Army, or the "International." To the Trotskyists came up with still another excuse for tailoring the Communists—three countries were technologically backward and US imperialism, as "enemy No. 1, would only be interested in non-capitalism, and therefore one must be with the Communist camp."

Now, what can possibly be the excuse for not unfolding a totally new philosophy of liberation free from all that is known about what they call "betraying Stalinism"? France is not situated nor a backward country. It is far from having "workers power" (threat upon it, pure, degenerate, or in-between; from below or above which somehow has to be defended from "imperialism no. 2" as an outside force or some inner "uppers" unless that be precisely Gaullist which must be overthrown and which Communism, instead, is proping up)

France is a technologically advanced land which is in the very heart of Europe. It is a world power, with a future comparable to the U.S. And the native Communists have betrayed it not once but twice. (These three if you count the mid-1920s not only as it appeared in Spain, but also in France.)

When the Communists preferred sharing power with de Gaulle although they controlled the majority of the Resistance, and, again, even when the Marshall Plan came to "save" Europe for imperialist enemy no. 1, still the Trotskyists could not totally free themselves from the cold taints of the Communists. After all, the Trotskyists maintained, the Communists opposed the US purchase of Western Europe, they were the "vase party" and "the relationship of forces demanded," etc., etc., etc.

As in the mid-1940's, the Communists refused to fight for power if it meant facing an independent proletariat that came to power without the aid of the Communist Party or the Red Army, so in 1968 they "left" the proletariat only in order to betray it. How many betrayals are needed to kill the anti-colonialist Trotskyists about the class nature of present-day Communism even where it is not the state-power.

The answer is that the number of times is numbersless for the good and substantial reason that the Trotskyists themselves believe in state-capitalism and this leads them to the concept of the backwardness of the proletariat that is incapable of reaching socialism without being led by the "vanguard party." It is for this reason that the struggle against Stalinism, despite all the sacrifices, has remained in the state, that is to say, has looked like just a family quarrel precisely because that is all it is.

It is for this reason that snorting "betrayals," "class collaboration," "new form of reformism," means nothing since they continue to tail the Communists as the ground that "only in action" can they win over the masses in general and the rank and file Communists in particular. The elaborate subtle-tongued for the Trotskyist vanguard behavior has stood out nowhere more clearly than in the self-parody which they brought upon themselves in France in 1968.

Although they have been in the forefront of the militants calling for workers' power and the revolution has only been arrested, not defeated, though dejected, although it is from this that is by the Communists who are willing to settle for a few ministerial posts in an imperialist Assembly, yet the Trotskyists do not deny a class division between themselves and the Communists. The reason for this can be that the one explanation: they have no sense that is to say, genuine Marxist philosophy of revolution, but only a variant of the Communist line, can, for once again, the masses are ready to die.

No doubt it is brave to die for the revolution. The point, how- ever, is to live for it. That is to say, to assure the revolution's success by a new unity of theory and practice which reflects, not on some "vanguard party," but on the masses, the masses the who would help forge out this totally new philosophy because they had a vision of a fully emancipated society.

TO LIVE FOR THE REVOLUTION

To live for the revolution is not done only in action, nor only in ideas. It is impossible to prove "in action" that you do indeed have a philosophy of liberation that is from not only the concept of the state, not only the concept of the state, and totally dependent on only one force beside a philos- ophy of liberation that is from not only the concept of the state, but on the masses, the masses the who will themselves "to a man" reconstruct society on totally new, humanistic beginnings.
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The general strike in France was not, after all, just an economic strike. And this was so, not because there were no economic demands, but because they clearly were not the dominant demands. This was not just a political strike, again not because there were no political demands, but because these, too, did not dominate.

This general strike sharpened all class relations, and not only in the factory, but also in the nature of education and "culture." In achieving this, the general strike went beyond economics, beyond politics, questioned the very way of life and its underlying philosophy.

No one, not even the bourgeoisie, failed to recognize that, both among the workers and the students, this was not just a dollar and cent nor a parliamentary struggle. The general strike of 10 million French workers brought the whole economy to a standstill, was not isolated from the student youth that inspired it and, and, together they nearly toppled de Gaulle.

Yet the revolutionary situation did not develop into a full revolution. And while the counter-revolution is mobilizing both visibly and clandestinely, the revolutionary forces are in disarray, not because they were defeated, but because they lacked the unifying element of a philosophy of revolution. It is no accident that it was in East Europe, precisely because their struggle was directly against Communism in power, that this was expressed most clearly by Daniel Pajolek in Socialist Humanism, p. 196.

"Philosophy and Revolution is only another way of expressing Marx's well-known catch phrase about the 'realization of philosophy,' beginning as a revolution in philosophy in order to end as a revolutionary philosophy in the form of the philosophy of the revolution." This is the missing ingredient in France today.

For the 10 million workers and tens of thousands of students who have taken this new page in world freedom—the first such in the post-war world in a technologically advanced land—the world and France is still full of revolutionary possibilities. For the heroic Frenchmen who have already destroyed so many myths from the immortality of de Gaulle to the myth that global greymatter is a substitute for social revolution within a country from the myth that Communism represents "the Left" is the myth that revolutions can be made without the proletariat; for the world that has watched this drama of revolutionary change in the heart of Europe and saw France standing on the threshold of revolution, a new rebirth of revolutionary passion and revolutionary philosophy is sure finally to sealonce.

The one still remaining advantage the French masses possess is that their revolution has not been defeated. It has been arrested; it is threatened by the weight of counter-revolution is visible. But there is time yet for reorganization and rearming with a philosophy for our age, the concretization of the Humanism of Marxism.
Editorial Statement

All Eyes On Czechoslovakia, All Hands Off!

A new page in the history of freedom is being written in Czechoslovakia. It is vividly described in the report, "The Road of Two Worlds," which appeared recently in the New York Times. The report is based on the dramatic events that have taken place in Czechoslovakia, and it provides an excellent opportunity to examine the implications of these events.

The report begins by highlighting the significance of the events in Czechoslovakia. The country is on the verge of a major political and social upheaval, and the report provides a detailed analysis of the underlying causes of this situation. The report also discusses the implications of these events for the future of Europe and the world.

The report then goes on to describe the events that have led to the crisis in Czechoslovakia. It highlights the role of the West in fostering a receptiveness to democracy in the country, and it notes that this receptiveness has been met with a strong and determined resistance from the authorities. The report also notes that the political leadership in Czechoslovakia has failed to address the issues that have led to the crisis, and it calls for an urgent and determined response from the international community.

The report concludes by urging the international community to take action to support democracy in Czechoslovakia. It notes that the country is at a crossroads, and that the outcome of the current events will have far-reaching implications for the future of Europe and the world. The report calls for a united and determined response from the international community to support democracy in Czechoslovakia and to hold the authorities accountable for their actions.

The report is an excellent resource for anyone interested in understanding the current situation in Czechoslovakia and the implications of these events for the future of Europe.

Aug.-Sept. 1988
THE PARTY, THE PARTY

Without engaging in revolution, the Czechoslovak New Left did touch the raw nerve of Communism—\textbf{in this case, Czechoslovakia as well as Russian Communism}. They did this by questioning the concept of the vanguard, not to mention omnipotent role of the Communist Party. Here Dubcek refused to budge. On the contrary, he was not only adamant about the leading role of the Party. He not only claimed total credit for the new road of “democratization.” And he not only opposed the creation of new opposition parties. He also stood out the claim that “the greatest majority of the best creative minds in the country is in the Party.”

This, then, defines the next battleground of ideas. Hence, the importance of the fact that the philosopher, Ivan Sviták, and others, who raised the question of opposition parties, the role of the Communist Party, raised them as incomparable from their philosophical foundation, on the one hand, and the needed unity of worker and intellectual, on the other hand.

In raising the fundamental question of philosophy and revolution, the party and spontaneously, the unity of worker and intellectual, they have indeed laid the foundation of a new relationship of theory to practice. Therefore, they have gone far beyond anything raised by the New Left in “the West.”

The reporter from Prague whom we print in this special issue of News & Letters rightly stresses that the events he describes are but the first act of a live drama whose ending cannot possibly be known in advance. Show your solidarity with Czechoslovakia.

August 8, 1968

Raya Dunayevskaya
THE CURRENT CRISIS

By IVAN SVITAK

The three-months' interludes between totalitarian dictatorship and totalitarianism's avowal, with the adoption of the democratic programme by the communist party. Now only could the second stage of the democratisation process start, a stage that is much more significant than the first one, a stage that still decide the character of the future political situation. The second stage will decisively be influenced by the central political question.

This question formulated in different ways: the six million non-party members, citizens of this country, have the same political rights as members of the communist party—or should they be given only a greater amount of freedom, not undermining the privileges of the party members? Are we going to democratize free and secret elections or are we going to play the old game with new people? Are we going to live in a working European state or in a non-soviet social democratic welfare state, where leading representatives fear most of all those divisions of their own allies?

PRAGUE SPRING

What happened in the first democratisation stage that has been concluded in March? There were two types of changes: seemingly significant personnel changes, which are, however, structurally insignificant, and much more important structural changes carried out that date from the October 28 revolution and incorporation. The first type of changes caused mass excitement as they were accompanied by an upsurge of peaceful demonstrations against the government that are to pay for the sins. The second type of changes brought about an understanding that government was improved but imperfect, but after all, an unwonted political turn.

The personnel, structurally insignificant changes were as far carried out in the supreme office and restructured the personnel: the first Secretary of the Communist Party, the President, the Chancellor of the National Assembly, the Prime Minister and Secretary of the Communist Party and some representatives of an independent party. The resulting disturbances carried out an exchange of personalities, publicly proclaimed in crisis and the desire for a new political life.

At the same time it left untouched all its mechanisms and did not retire from the responsibility of the old course of his mandate as deputy or his place as a member of the central committee of the communist party. The progressives and the conservatives made a temporary compromise which must soon fall apart, because it is impossible to continue in the demagogic search of some party members in the so-called market society, such as, who are linked by armed bonds with their own victims. The result of the consensualization in existing positions is finished. Party members could not have their say in this matter, and the new mechanism was to be their government. If you want to hear our voices, then direct the government to the representatives of the six million adults—citizen members. We have just as good candidates as you nominated by the communist party and perhaps even better ones.

DISINHERIT personal changes there were also a number of structural changes, which are much more significant guarantees of democracy than the new personnel:

1. an actual, not legal freedom of press and a limited number of opposition, which really is the freedom of assembly.

2. an actual wave of political demands, directed among others, to the demand for rehabilitation of political victims.

3. the coming into existence of the first associations, discussion clubs and bodies of all citizens, where first time an alternative of the old policy is being created.

The way to integrate opposition groups is quite hard, but it must be expected that pressure will be directed against them in the sense of gradual limitation and regulation. We must, therefore, develop our civil rights, energetically and consistently, without hesitation, without exception, but without haste, quickly, in the masses of the non-party members, and act according.
course of the elections, that they want to put up independent deputies. We shall not vote for anyone who was a deputy in the present National Assembly. Not for anyone without any exception.

As present the clubs associate various political opinions of non-party members: They at the same time represent the aims for the activity of non-party members in special interest organizations, study the trade unions, and the youth movement. So far we can say yet not favor the organisational form of the clubs and their future necessary politically more precise shape.

WE SHOULD soon submit to the broader public a certain political conception, with a kind of minimum programme of civil freedoms in Czechoslovakia. It is not necessary to put forward the most radical demands, but to pleace ourselves, the non-party member candidates and the future prospective representatives of state power to fulfill the principal demands on the basis of which we are willing to support certain deputies.

Clubs of non-party members should quickly arise in many organizations, unions of artists, and should guarantee the basic programme of human rights. If democratization means the normalization of conditions leading towards democracy, then nothing can stand in the way of this activity. I openly state that we are not enemies of communism, that we will have nothing to do with the policy of anti-communism. We are fully responsible, adult, politically thinking citizens of a socialist country, who have undergone the tutelage of the police-bureaucratic regime and want freedom and socialism.

We are striving for a parliamentary opposition as an alternative of the present execution of state power, because we fear that an extra-parliamentary opposition would be much more dangerous. If the political activity of the people will not be purposefully included in the creation of the socialist democracy, then it will necessarily take up itself much more problematic forms, which it will be difficult to stop and which could endanger also the state and both its nations.

We know from an old fairy tale that the wolf had his voice changed to be able to get at the lamb. We know the voice of the wolves, the voice that was just as dangerous for communists as for non-party members. We shall not open the door, whom he will try to convince us with a changed voice, because only fairy tales have a happy end. We do not, a priest, mistrust the communist, but in answer to any gentleman whose voice is breaking we clearly answer no.

The victory of little David over the giant Goliath is a myth. A reality on the other hand are the descendants of the people, whom Hitler’s fascist dictatorship burned to millions in the gas chambers of the concentration camps, the young Israelis who tell us:

Never again like sheep! Never again like sheep!

—Jan Svitáč
Prague, April 30, 1968
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October 1968
CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Revolution and Counter Revolution

In the midst of the night, where most of Czechoslovakia slept, hundreds of thousands of Communist troops, in countless columns of Russian tanks, rolled into the country which had just completed the very first act of peaceful revolution—ousting the old Stalinist (Novak) leadership and electing a new one, establishing a free press, radio, TV, and above all, ruling the people with their own laws. The ruling Russian bureaucracy had tried to justify their counter-revolutionary act by inventing a blizzard of falsehoods, to the effect that the Russian Communist Party and state leaders had been "invited" to preserve, unscathed, the Czechoslovakia. Instead, what the invading troops found were a people savagely beaten as in an opposition to the occupiers—and not from West Germany, as charged, but from the "fraternal Communist countries." The youth who were supposed to have been interested in nothing but "material things" were laying their lives down for the freedom of their country. "The little old ladies" who were supposed to have lived their lives, were torturing the troops as, by the thousands, and tens of thousands, the people streamed into the streets to sit defiantly in the squares. Brief but effective strikes were carried out. No Czechoslovak collaborators were found anywhere.

DUBcek: ILLUSION OR COMPROMISE?

Not only could the invaders not find a Quisling, they could not even find a Nadar. The defense was total. When their leaders returned from Moscow, having there accepted the degrading conditions of the invading power, and showing their willingness to speak with two voices. The Resistance continued. So Dubcek is back in Moscow trying to see whether he can get the occupying forces out of his country, is he subject to such vacillation or only for fornication to make accommodation acceptable?

"For three minutes on Red Square I felt free, I am glad to take your three years for this.

—Vladimír Doležal, 23 year old student, upon being sentenced to prison for protesting the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia.

The shock of the invasion did not reach itself in the non-Communist world, but generalized in the Communist parties. Then, the countries of the Western alliance—Europe and the French—opposed, as did the British Communist Party and those of the Eastern association.

What is far more important is that the brutal invasion of Czechoslovakia has made it necessary for anti-Communist movements to fight on two fronts since it has, of precisely, eradicated the position of freedom fighters in the Russian, and not just American, danger. Surely, the Russian Communist Party is no more then the Russian Communist Party, and the Great German-Russian conflict is no more then the Great German-Russian conflict. There are some who think that it was Poland’s Władysław Gomułka, faced at home both from the Left and the extreme nationalist Right, who tipped the scale in favor of invasion. There are others who think the Russians have been led into the fatal decision by East Germany’s Walter Ulbricht, who built an impenetrable Berlin wall, which is not a barrier, is a barrier, but from Czechoslovakia easily cross over into West Germany. There is, of course, no need that both of these situations were in the same way; the Cold War is not the way to the tail wagging the dog doesn’t know the Russian bear.

"Would I go to jail for something I think is not right?"
—Vladimír Doležal, unemployed worker sentenced to three years in a prison camp, upon being asked by the Russian court if he still considered that his protest was right.

No, to receive the reasons for such a calamitous adventure one must look at Russia itself. Moreover, the looking at Russia, one cannot restrict himself to only at representations of Russia of events abroad. Rather, one must keep eyes on what is happening in Russia from Russia.

As against the Slavoya and Daniel trial in 1956, the 1967 trial of Ginsburg and others (who are not part of the inner core of the highly structured Moscow literary establishment) but expanded their “platform” from literary freedom to civil rights, including that of public demonstrations in which they had participated. While it is true that these are still literary men, and they have not succeeded in establishing a role with workers as the Czechoslovak intellectuals, there is no doubt that unofficial gatherings still underground publish “literary essays,” including expressions of sympathy for Czechoslovakia, and demand, for more freedom in Russia. The ruling bureaucracy knows well that where there is that much discontent in the privileged strata of the population, the restlessness among the masses is deep indeed. As one inmate of the Vorkuta forced labor camp, where there was a revolt back in 1953, expressed it then: “Russia is more than ever full of revolutionaries.”

Thus, two altogether new features characterize the latest trial— that of Pavel Litvinov, Lyuba Jordan, Konstantin Rassilnik, Vasily Delone, and Vladimir Dremilya. First and foremost, this group appears this day after the invasion of Czechoslovakia with letters demanding “Hands Off Czechoslovakia!” Secondly, this group of young intellectuals included an unemployed worker, Vladimir Dremilya.

The current military action of violating the sovereignty of Czechoslovakia was not in most militant sheets, but in the pressmen’s clock signaling the creation of Communism’s grandfathers. AsJean Brulé put it the day of the invasion: “Authentic Marxism in the main enemy of the Soviet power elite, not the Americans or Churces.”

What delusion to think that such an “enemy” can be stopped by tanks. Nothing can divert the masses from the road to freedom, much less the idea of freedom. No revolution, even the world’s revolution, which is more successful than the struggle for power between Russia and America, or Russia and the West. And yet, Czechoslovakia itself is proof of the emergence of a new world movement as a freedom movement, the very existence of which overshadows the Marxist-Humanist approach.

SPEAKER OF HUMANITY

A specter is haunting Communism as it has haunted private capitalism—the specter of Marx-Humanism. It is this, the specter which crossed over the boundaries between nationalities within a country not the borders between countries. It is this specter which crossed the boundaries that separate the generations and keeps workers and intellectuals apart, transcendent, and not something superhuman or supra-historical, but as the very stuff of which revolutions are made and remade. Its unifying vision of spontaneous and organismic movement as a single force coming to an understanding, but reappears itself as a forward movement of the masses.

Czechoslovakia today may not have reached the heights of Hungarian October 1956 with its Workers’ Councils. But it has established new points of departure for unifying Marx’s theory of liberation with his practice, and for this Czechoslovakia will forever remain enthralled in the hearts and minds of freedom fighters the world over. The Aug. 23 invasion by Russia and its satellites can no more erase the Czechoslovak experience than it can stop history from dialectically developing to the end that something which is falsely named “Czechoslovakia” will be more than ever a living humanism, world humanism, which is not longer only what it was when Marx first proclaimed it in 1845, or even as restated in 1956 in the Hungarian Revolution.

October 4, 1968

Eva Birgusovskaia, Chairman

News & Letters Coordinators

Detroit

Harry McShane, Chairman

The Marxist-Humanist Group

Glasgow

November, 1968
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Kolakowski On Alienation

The title of the article is "The Alienation of Reason: A History of Positivist Thought" by Leszek Kolakowski. The article discusses the concept of alienation in the context of positivist thought, particularly in relation to the work of the Belgian philosopher Henri Poincaré. Kolakowski challenges the idea that positivist thought is inherently anti-intellectual and suggests that it is instead characterized by a desire for intellectual clarity and precision. He argues that positivism is a form of alienation, as it creates a barrier between the scientific community and the general public. The article is a critical examination of the positivist movement and its impact on the development of modern philosophy.
THIS REVIEWER considers the above chapter, "Logical Empiricism: A Scientific Defense of Threatened Civilization," the most important chapter of the book. Both in its attack on science, "technological efficiency," and the "pragmatic interpretation of truth" as well as in the way the author relates Positivism to the specific historical period between the two world wars, Kolakowski is crying out his opposition.

But, suddenly, Kolakowski sees merit in Positivism: "The sheer vigor of the positivist rule has awakened intellectuals to their own responsibilities, and in my opinion they have been of practical aid in countering attempts to blur the boundaries between the position of the scientist and the obligations of the believer." (p. 106)

Anyone who is acquainted with Kolakowski's most famous work during the 1950s period, History and Responsibility, can have no doubt about whom he is castigating. Moreover, Kolakowski returns to his critique of Positivism where institutionalized Communism can certainly see its reflection.

THIS QUEST for Reason and refusal to lose the identity of the "Subject" will continue to "create" the individual as "something" quite unique, irresponsible, "negative," i.e., revolutionary, and pushing history forward. And Kolakowski, in conclusion, therefore, reposes the question that has been running like a red thread throughout his work: "How can we account for the peculiar fact that over many centuries human thought has ascribed to 'reason' the ability to discover 'necessary' features in the world, and for so long a time failed to see that these features are figments of the imagination? The vast amount of energy squandered in these explorations and the extraordinary intensity with which they were carried on are worth pondering, all the more because the explorers were perfectly aware of the technological inutility of their efforts." (pp. 215, 216)

The reviewer must end with apologies to the reader for not letting him in on Kolakowski's highly original views on the very topic that would no doubt most interest the American reader — the chapter on Pragmatism. He will need to read this for himself and, since it is a field with which he is familiar, have the special pleasure of comparing his views with those of Professor Kolakowski. He will, in any case, find this experience especially rewarding because the excellent translation by Norbert Guterman will make him forget that he is reading a translation.
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Of Arms, Men and Racism

NIXON, New, Old and Napoleonic

By Baya Damyanscyka
Chairman National Editorial Board

On Jan. 3, in what he billed as his last public dinner speech before inauguration, Nixon postponed a visit to the President and the presidency. For many precisely that intelligence which would stress Nixon's noncompliance. — When Nixon is alone in a room is anyone there?—Nixon's own least centered attention on the most fantastic imperial power that the world has ever seen. It was clear that, in asking President Johnson, he was feasting the presidency which he would wield for the next four crucial years.

The 12 days or so, musing, vacillating, mindless, rich WASPS, that Nixon named to the Cabinet dissipated still another facet of the old Cold War warrior who had first sprang to note during Joe McCarthy's witch-hunting days, that of a man Napoleon dreaming to be a big one, "alone" setting foreign and domestic policies.

Designated for the number one job in the Cabinet, the Secretary of the State, William P. Rogers, is a one-man to say in praise of himself: "I have never said or written a word about Vietnam, I am very happy about that." Allegedly, this says how uncommitted the new administration is to old policies.

Instead, it discloses computer-oriented mindlessness of the new Cabinet regarding the Borneo Vietnam war that is tearing this nation apart, that brought down the Johnson Administration, and is sure to do the same to Nixon.

In any case, neither Nixon nor his Defense Secretary, Melvin Laird, from Joe McCarthy's home district, can lay claim to a record that is quite such a job short. The charge against him is, after William P. Rogers. On the contrary, for the white-sheeted desire to win the war, the Committee to need appear like a cliché, of the Vietnam war, could quite turn the headless Senator into a thorough Secretary of Defense.

"Nuclear Supremacy"

To Nixon himself was the one who delivered the most impressive speeches of the campaign. In its final laps, he suddenly discovered a "security gap," thereby expanding the Vietnam war to a possible nuclear confrontation with Russia.

Our new little Napoleon promised to close the security gap to restore "noneupremacy," hold up the "security gap," and give greater weight to the military set up in the top civilian administrator in the Department of Defense: "If I were to restructure the military, I would do nothing but alter the balance...for I do not know how to make the best of it..." Nixon is busy staffing the administration with successful businessmen in the Eisenhower tradition. The formula of the then Secretary of Defense Wilson was: "What is good for GM is good for the country."

U.S. AND RUSSIA ENTER MIDDLE EAST COCKPIT

By V. A. DAVYDOVSKAYA
Chairman, National Editorial Board

The barbaric act of hanging 14 men from their necks in the public square in Baghdad has received attention, not so much as an act of "Barbarism," but as the demonstration of Iraq's revolt. A decade ago it seemed to herald a new world. Today it has nothing to hang on its exiled country to Israel. And even this "unifying force" failed to unify the Arab world.

IRAQ, EGYPT, AND NIXON TOO

The present Iraqi government, the newest in a series of military coups and counter-coups, embarked upon the "discovery of Israeli nay nays" soon after taking power to "tame" the nation's centrifugal forces. Obviously, it was harder to achieve clear government than to pin down propaganda against the remaining 2,500 Jews in the country when a growing number of "Arab leaders" were designated as "Fifth Columnists." Although other Arab countries, especially Egypt and Syria, suspected the move against anti-Semitism was being used to move against "Arab nationalists," they at first could say little against the military junta headed by General Ahmed Hassan al-Bakr, because their representatives held most adult Jewish males in prisons, and find anti-Israel propaganda almost the only unifying cement of theirrickety Westernized countries.

After two months of "interrogations" and trials, however, one former high official of the Iraqi Government, a left-Bakrist, was declared dead "while undergoing interrogation." Others, still held in jail, are feared to be among those marked for future hangings.

Even foreign diplomats were not exempt from violent physical attacks. Indeed, on the very day of the hanging of "Israelis," a Syrian diplomat was wounded on a street in Baghdad.

The last straw, however, as Egypt was concerned, was thrown by al-Bakr, a notorious anti-Semite, who demanded that the Arab press drop its "anti-Semitism". The main Egyptian daily wrote that the gory spectacle was "not a heart-warming sight nor is it the occasion for organizing a festival and inviting invitations."

Consider then, the sensitivity of the new Nissam Administration which announced that the President was looking for "new approaches" to the Middle East, that "the unity of efforts in the Middle East extends from the United States to the United Arab Emirates," and that the "courage" conference which will attempt to impose "peace" on the Middle East without either Arab or Israeli having a say in the determination of their own fate, is to be attended by the Western powers of the Westernization of the Middle East crisis.


Russia stood alongside the savage executors. No denial, part of the reason is the espionage activity it has been engaged in all along, its "inner warfront". A more important reason is the lack of criticism, at a time when Egypt and Syria did attack the government's conduct of the liberation of the South Arabian junta's questioning of the granting of concessions by the former administration in France to give 10,000,000 square kilometers of Israeli territory for oil development. Russia's interest in the same project over-shadowed the question to go along with the Kremlin's proposal for "Middle East peace," or to line up with the "Arab socialists."

Overweighting both considerations is the possibility of the U.S.S.R. Russia "defence", but it is clear, U.S. conception that Russia is in the Middle East to stay.

This doesn't mean that Nixon is walking into a "trap." On the contrary. Pretending that the U.S.S.R. does not see further Russian expansion into the Middle Eastern area is thinking too late in the world's balance of power. It is anxious to re-establish its role in the Middle East before a confrontation with Russia. The U.S. can only with Russia -- little powers must not be allowed to set the time for the nuclear balance, as if it is the lies of the Little ones that are at stake. In a way, the anti-hegemonic consider the Middle East an area for a "world power struggle", not for an Arab-Israeli constitutional issue of time.

"Before the Arab-Israeli War in 1967, when both Russia and the U.S., the U.S.S.R. was to "control" their "sphere of influence", the two super-powers could disregard the French proposal for a "Big Four" conference, now differ on it. Russia wants to accept the joint partnerships of France and Britain and even the "world body", to diet a "settlement."

The stage is set for the deal. The Soviet Union is also asking for a "settlement" in their respective places. But what about the real act, the new world order? Does it mean that what happened in that new, third world that it can now be ignored?

The ARAB REVOLUTIONS

There was a time when getting rid of Western imperialism and internal feudalism in the Arab Middle East took priority over an Arab-Israeli resolution. It is true that the setting up of the independent state of Iraq in what was formerly Palutonia brought, in the aftermath of the first Arab-Israeli war, the very success of Palutonia's freedom from British imperialism set motion truly independent Arab nationalism. A reformation other than a new human dimension "freedom" entered the Middle East.

By 1965, when the Iraqi revolution threatened the Hashemite monarchy, the whole Middle East strategy of anti-national revolutions, for American imperialism, fell apart. By breaking the kingpin out from under neo-colonialism in the Middle East, it became possible to start an independent path.

Iraqi nationalism refused also to follow other Nasserites at the head of the socialist coalition the "Syrian Party" in Syria. As against the tendency to single party rule, Kasim, who headed the first republic of Iraq, allowed the survival of political parties, from moderate to Communists. (Now only in Iraq is the Communist Party a legal party.) The unfinished state of the revolution, necessary of mass base, however, made it impossible to fight the entrenched feudal landlords. The agricultural reforms were not implemented and when the Kurds demanded autonomy, the revolt was bloodily put down. A further political vacuum was created with Russia, including all parties. The isolation from the masses was completed with the increase in unemployment and poverty. By 1967 Kasim rule was bloodily overthrown by a Ba'athist led military coup.

The next two-stage coup on July 17 and again on July 20 brought to power a right-wing Ba'athist officer army general. The young colonels who seized the coup were soon settled. The new Junta issued against the "French talking" but did nothing to get the country out of the bloody crisis into which it had been plunged by the disastrous Arab-Israeli War in 1967.

The country is in chaos, and yet it, precisely, the total disorder of the ruling classes and the military, on the one hand, and, on the other hand the dissolution of the great masses (Israel, oil, base, and the Kurds that has, in fact, created a new revolutionary situation, in the country. It is fear of a revolution that has compelled the al-Bakr clique to rely solely on the enmity in Iraq and pure anti-semitism that is at the core of the whole concoction.

It is this which discloses yet another aspect of anti-Semitism, specially Russian anti-Semitism, anti-revolutionary.

RUSSIAN ANTI-SEMITHISM, ANTI-REVOLUTION

Had it not been for the hangings in Iraq and the Russian stance about them in face of the attack by the Arab countries about them in face of the attack by the Arab countries, Russia, once closely aligned to Russia, one may not have felt compelled to take a second look at the existence of anti-Semitism in the Russian society, thinking back to Stalin's reign. Because, in theory, Communist stance opposed anti-Semitism, it was nothing in finding in it as such. There was all too easy to attribute it to Stalin's paranoia, rather than to the objective conditions which led to anti-Semitic propaganda - a state-capitalist society, inside and outside of the Soviet Union. For Stalin's opposition to Stalin's rule could be seen even as the point of departure.

For one thing, the morose Russian masses remain at labor under the same exploitative conditions as they had done during the war. To get a sufficient labor force, all penalties for violations of Stalin's fatherland "laws" were canceled.

Secondly, there were the returning veterans who had seen the "West" and failed to learn from it. Thirdly, the youth and intellectual opposition grow. It is because the revolutionary opposition grows that Stalin's
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Oslo, the anti-Semitic campaign that has euphemistically called the struggle against "rootless cosmopolitanism." Anti-Semitism had nothing to do with the rise of Israel (which, at first, Stalin voted for), nor did the Jews have anything to do with internal revolutions in Russia — the revolutions of the Russian masses with Stalinists. Anti-Semitism had nothing to do with "rootless cosmopolitanism." Stalinism had nothing to do with the growth of Israel (which, at first, Stalin voted for), nor did the Jews have anything to do with internal revolutions in Russia — the revolutions of the Russian masses with Stalinists. The notorious "Doctors Plot" was not a struggle against "Zionism," nor was it against revolutionary opponents in Russia and in the satellites. How quickly old radicals forget, once a new situation arises, and a new enemy is discovered.

Of course, imperialism, whether Western or Zionist — or, for that matter, Communist of either the Russian or Chinese variety — has to be fought and destroyed, but how does it compare with the supposed "Zionism" (from the varieties of Trotskyism to the most "nationalist") in an effort to designate all the Arab lands, including even the feudal monarchies, as "representing the progressive forces"? What accounts for the designation of Israel, from its birth to its present, as the most persistent anti-Zionist manifestation, as representing "Western imperialism"?

Of course, nationalism must not be restricted to the Jews, but how does it compare with the "Zionism" (from the varieties of Trotskyism to the most "nationalist") in an effort to designate all the Arab lands, including even the feudal monarchies, as "Progressive forces"? What accounts for the designation of Israel, from its birth to its present, as the most persistent anti-Zionist manifestation, as representing "Western imperialism"?

Of course, imperialism is but one manifestation of capitalism. But when a "national" country like Poland in 1960 carries on an anti-Semitic campaign against its revolutionary opponents, it is only to expose the Stalin in establishing a special "Jewish Department," to use the state in establishing a special "Jewish Department," to expose Stalinism as emphasizing the class struggle within each existing power on the history of the Stalinist-Maoist-Castrist "new camp" theory of the world. There has to be an independent way out. There lies...

Of course, anti-Semitism is but one manifestation of capitalism. But when a "national" country like Poland in 1960 carries on an anti-Semitic campaign against its revolutionary opponents, it is only to emphasize Stalinism as emphasizing the class struggle within each existing power on the history of the Stalinist-Maoist-Castrist "new camp" theory of the world. There has to be an independent way out. There lies...

Social Revolution

The danger now is to force a false "Arab unity" against Israel, or "Zionist unity" against Arabs, thereby not only unifying the Big Powers on a course for intervention, but actually shifting the new emerging revolutionary forces throughout the Middle East, with an Stalin crushed every revolution in the path of the Red Army as well as every revolutionary movement that dared aspire to power outside of the Red Army area.

We have seen the same role reenacted in Paris last Spring. Are we now to have it reenacted in the Middle East? This would be the greatest crime any revolutionary could commit. For, note this, the resistance of the Arab masses and the demand of the Arabs for autonomy has been directed, not at Israel, but Iraq. The opposition in the camps of Syria and the Arab role; the very narrow mass base of the Arab leadership is enough of the Arab leadership's total isolation from the masses. And the student demonstrations in Egypt, as all over the world, directed not at a "foreign" enemy, but against the native ruler.

Nationalism is not the issue. It was a decade ago when it seemed to be the way to fight both imperialism and native class. But the results have been more comprehensive: the theory of liberation that would release the new revolutionary masses and transform the pre-revolutionary situation into social revolution.

This is not the place to question, or debate, or argue, or even to summarize the entire debate over the Asiatic question. We only have a report, and we will see new forces of liberation emerging. Do not mistake them.

February 1969

Pakistani leader

"Where are you calling an anti-Semite, you Jew-hater?"

—From Shadi's (France), July 25, 1968.

Zionism. It was the thrust of nationalism that unified the nation. Commandery from without, led by exiles of the "Jewish "national" movement," it was the thrust of nationalism that unified the nation. Commandery from without, led by exiles of the "Jewish "national" movement," it was the thrust of nationalism that unified the nation.
Hegel vs. Mao: From Culture to Philosophy to Revolution

April, 1969

Hegel vs. Mao From Culture to Philosophy to Revolution

In a noted form, Comunism has been showing all over again what the supreme elemental outcome of productive revolution in Hungary had revealed in 1956: that the struggle for freedom involves, among other things, the breakdown of in the field of ideas against the entrenched ideology—what Marx called the feudalism of Commission, or private property and "equality of exchange and Bentham." These felicities of capitalist culture, in its private form, has been reduced in state-capitalist Commission by State Property and the Vanguard Party. In its these Hungarian Revolution denationalized and Czechoslovakia is made challenging. In their place the Hungarian Freedom Fighters had established Workers Commission against the "crisis of ideas" that the Humanism of Marx saw its first direct historical re-establishment. It is this which has been so long haunting Mao to this day.

Despite the opportunism and more anti-liberal humanism which has led Mao presently to oppose the Russian invasion, Mao has not changed one idea from 1956 when he urged Khrushchev—not that Khrushchev needed much urging—to lead a counter-revolution against the Hungarian Freedom Fighters.

It is true that in China, for a brief few weeks, Mao had opened a new road called "Let One Hundred Flowers Bloom, Let One Hundred Schools of Thought Contend." But the hypocrisy was clear from the start, in the intransigence that, under all circumstances, one and only one Party remained the "Leader." The moment the voices of revolt began contending vociferously against Mao, stating that what they had in China was not genuine Marxism, freedom, that freedom to speak out was needed, and, instead, China embarked on the so-called Great Leap Forward, Mao was not renouncing the steps of alienation described in the Phenomenology as if he were being stage-directed by Hegel from his grave.

Hegel’s Phenomenology and the Discipline of Culture

Marx considered Hegel’s Phenomenology "the birthplace of the Hegelian dialectic," which contains "all the elements of criticism frequently worked out in a manner far beyond the Hegelian standpoint," that is to say, very nearly Marxism. Marx insisted that Hegel’s abstractions were, in fact, expressions of "whole spheres like religion, the state, the family, etc." The part that directly concerned him here was the one Hegel entitled "Spirit in Its Inner-Struggle, the discipline of culture.

Not please, that so-called alienation, alienation, has not been overcome: we have now reached the point where we can not make a Hegelian "repetition." Symbolically, however, the personal existence of a Hegelian is the "lower" of a parade, already having to be adapted by Marxists projected, of course, they understood that in Hegel the criticism is "attaining a" that is to say, it is dealt with only in its thought forms. What saved Hegel was his personal existence of a decisive historic accent. Thus he praised the Enlightenment's struggle against superstition. "The Enlightenment," he wrote, "repeals the household arrangements which actually contains in the culture of faith by bringing in the freedom and for this purpose belongs to the whole of the Hegel and Now..." (p. 312).

In our day, the positive feature of a new culture "upsetting the household arrangements"—in our case, the dominant prejudice which constitutes with culture "faith"—the leading in the goods and furnishings belonging to the world of the Hegel and Now, in such a way as to "attain a" freer life. First, because it is true, and secondly, because such separation from the dominant supernatual is, as the Enlightenment itself was a step toward the French Revolution, and the Chinese also a step toward the Great Leap Forward.

We happen this day after the positive features, that are beginning, is what Hegel was writing and criticizing. First what is called the "enlightenment of revolution," which is always just on the surface, "the absolute and universal inversion of the historical revolution," the one from the other, which is the opposite of itself. (p. 941) This is not because, to begin with, the hero and the new was a "straitened reality." It can therefore be negated, but the limitations of culture make this impossible for now. "The noble type of consciousness" (p. 950) the bourgeoisie next stage is that "in state of revolt appears arrogance," unless one notes it as but a "straitened reality" and is ready to rough it off. M.A.S.

Mao’s Alienation from the Masses

Once freedom is the past, then nothing, culture included, will be allowed to stand in its way. Only then, to repeat the expression Hegel borrowed from Diderot, "will, one fine morning, it spirit evoke to constitute a show in the elbow, when, just as the child is Syng on the floor." But this "naive crack" just can’t be just discursive—which is, what attracts all—is it can’t be just a new road to freedom is open before you. It got open in the Phenomenology because it was Voltaire, the Theory of Practice and Practice which did the showing, made Reason see that Culture was but "straitened reality" and was not what he sought in the road to revolution (the French Revolution in Hegel’s case) was to be open.

If religion is the opiate of the people, culture is the "rum and cocoa-ella" come on. In the case of Mao once the alienation from the masses possessed him, he embarked in such a "naive crack of self-perpetuating disorder" called "Great Leap Forward" that it brought the country to near devastation. The leap to pretentious revolution by declaring the new, third world of underdeveloped countries to be the "new state of world revolution."

Thereby he hoped to win this new world and challenge Stalin’s leadership of the Communist world. It almost worked U.S. Intervention’s attack on South Vietnam in February 1965, however, made clear the need for united action—and when Mao refused such a united front with Russia to aid Vietnam, it brought about serious opposition both within his own Central Committee and on the part of other Communist Parties who previously had taken the Chinese’ side in the Sino-Soviet conflict.

The Full on Young Revolutionsaries

It was then, and only then, that Mao stopped the other show—revealing the real retrogressivist character of his thought. You could say that, though Mao didn’t recognize philosophically that he remembered him so long ago it predicted his coming. The fictitious character of the so-called cultural revolution struck the Chinese people with exploitative production, and the bland "four olds" (old ideas, old culture, old customs, and old habits) and not clear to reject this or class content. Only he who has no future is so scared of the past. By other means, including the Red Guards, the cult of Mao, a letter of Party Army, Red Guards all the genuine spirit of the ship at state is unacknowledged as was Louis XVI’s "enterprise d’estat." No. It is not Mao that concerns us. The only reason we speak so much (and so often) is because in this year of transition, when genuine freedom movements are arising very nearly daily, we have to recognize what can possibly be the pull of Mao’s, for instance, China—today’s young revolutionaries, black and white, who are neither tied to state power, or else party and/or official state, but hand, much less hunger for single world mastery.

The genius of Hegel, his reference for today, is that he summed up what he called "the experiences of consciousness" in so comprehensive a statement as a development—themselves from 500 B.C. and the Greek city-states to 1800 A.D. and the French Revolution—that the values that the summation of the past give us a glimpse of the future, especially radially, is genuinely understood in a Marxist-leninist, not vulgar economic, manner.

Briefly, this is this. There is a dialectic of thought from consciousness through culture to philosophy. There is a dialectic of history from slavery through servitude to free wage labor. There is a dialectic of the class struggle in the good part. It is, in particular, and it develops through certain specific stages in the development of society. This is a development of society which is the development of the new forms of revolt and new aspects of the philosophy of revolution.

Only a Marx could work out the latter. What Hegel had shown were the dangers inherent in the French Revolution which did not find the ministries but in Napoleon. In a word, the dialectic disclosed that the creative revolution is within the revolution. It is the greatest challenge man ever had to face.

In our age of mass-totalitarianism, the coming into existence of the popular revolutionary party to the new China, philosophy is not only the abjectly imperial orphans and poor among our age, much less to develop riot labor at all will, in the mixing link everyone rector determined will never be found. Then is an art, and a job, not a naif, backward, just as the threshold of the high-flying adventure, inside one of the existing world realities, rather, than more focused to a new society.
Excerpts from a Lecture

HUMANISM AND MARXISM

Mars' theory of liberation was unique in a way which illustrates why this discovery of what has been called the materialist conception of history and Marx's philosophy of humanism which, as he put it, is "destined to take both from materialism and humanism and the same condition of unity among them.

On Religion, Alienation and Science

Take hold of any one of Marx's famous statements that religion is the opium of the people. But few have the sense to maintain that when that sentence was first stated in its meant that it was the means by which God would destroy the state of individualism in the area of religion.

Religion is the opium of the people, as it is the real power of the state. It is the power of the state.

Religion is the power of the state.

The American Roots of Marxism: Against Racism

Truth is always relative. The most powerful and influential thinkers in the world are the most powerful and influential thinkers in the world.

The African slaves who were sold to the American slave owners were sold to the American slave owners because they were sold to the American slave owners. They were sold to the American slave owners because they were sold to the American slave owners.
JUNE-JULY, 1969

75 COMMUNIST PARTIES MEET

The two topics—the Sino-Soviet conflict and the Czechoslovak "violation"—that were most discussed at the recently concluded Moscow conference were not the ones that are growing at the vital 75 Communist Parties. The way in which they were handled will, however, illuminate that peculiar brand of nationalism that, at one and the same time, seems apart and belongs together state capitalism. It is necessary, therefore, to turn to the different attitudes to the points in dispute.

BRESHEAR AND THE "DISSENTER" ON MAO

Mao is one question Brezhnev wanted aired and the dissident Communist Parties wanted to avoid. To get these parties in the conference Brezhnev had to promise that the question of China would be brought up on the agenda. The reason for the breach of faith was that "a new situation had arisen," Brezhnev claimed that "only two days ago" the Chinese press had issued "the call to prepare both for conventional and big warfare against Soviet revisionism...." The combination of the Chinese leaders' partial victory and the sustained atmosphere of war hysteria inject new elements into the international situation and we cannot ignore it."

The truth, however, is that, as we have seen, we were to disregard that the Sino-Soviet conflict, begun in 1969, had reached just this high intensity during the 1967 "Cultural Revolution" with its accumulation of "Russian collaboration with American imperialism, the "new" situation arose no later than January, 1969, with the absolutely unexpected, admitted identification of "Russian revisionism" as "the enemy."" At the most basic state document, the draft Chinese Constitution itself. And finally, it was the Eighth Congress of the Chinese Communist Party, called to ratify the new Constitution in April, Lin Piao hacked out the accumulation, thus: "The Soviet revisionist renegade clique has been practicing serious imperialist policies and social fascism more frightfully than ever."

Hitherto containing this vileness, spoken in April, the "dissenter" had Brezhnev remove the promise not to deal with China at the preparatory conference held at least as late as May 27. Moreover, though those tables on the same page, the Chinese had been making equally vilenous accusations against China of the Russian press. During 1968, Mao and his very nearly called for a preventive war which, after speaking of the "chronicle-hegemonic" war to the same point, turn around and sharply reversed it, in "it was clearly a ruthless offensive to undermine China's forces." (2) It is true that nothing could possibly have happened "only two weeks ago" that article had beenbabbling since the January draft Constitution and the April Lin Piao speech, on the one hand, and the May statements of the Russian generals on the other, considering the constant border incidents, on the other hand. But Brezhnev was not ready for a "hyper" conference. The "dissenter" would have had to be not merely a rumble, but actually a rumble in his voice as the text reappeared. As before. Russia's invasion of Czechoslovakia!

THE HYPOCRISY OF THE "DISSENTER"

The East European statesmen and West European aspirants to the same, were far from being naive, much less moronic. Indeed they were knowledgeable in the ways of Big Brother, and had as successfully resisted Khrushchev's attempt to call just such a "plenum" conference that he, not they, had his head. How then did Brezhnev win where Khrushchev lost? And at a time when the constant pressure with China, which is far, far away, was much exaggerated, but when a country much closer to home had a country that was engaged, not in attacking Russia, but in trying to reform itself, had never been invaded by Big Brother's troops—500,000 strong!

Therefore, precisely, lies one answer. The occupation of Czechoslovakia created terror throughout East Europe.

The Roumanian had rejected the notorious Brezhnev doctrine of "limited sovereignty," declaring: "Limited sovereignty makes no more sense than limited honesty." Nevertheless, Czechoslovakia, as he had previously done, walked out in detail when there was a breach of faith. It is true he wished to cut down Russian hegemony: "It is not necessary to have any leading country." (4) But it was quite obvious that the autonomy of the Communist Parties was the very specific nationalism of Romanian Communism. He aimed not at "national" Czechoslovakia by more! (5)

Another reason—a more crucial one than as the class nature of present-day Communist is concerned—for Brezhnev's "victory" is that the "dissenters" are themselves either state capitalist bourgeoisies like Roumania, or hoping in some way to become part of a government coalition. Thus, the Italian Communist Party, the largest in Western Europe, hopes to do very well in the next general election.

The fact that its representative, Ettore Brelingger, is the most outspoken critic of Russian monopoly, both as it concerns his "intervention" in Czechoslovakia, and its propaganda against Mao, must therefore, be related to these expectations. In a word, there is more opportunity than courage in the way the "dissenters" are at the Moscow conference. This becomes especially clear in his speech on May where he, at one and the same time, criticized Chinese Communism and opened Russia's attempt to "communicate." Mao from the world movement. Ettore Brelingger's speech on Czechoslovakia was the most outspoken one at the Moscow conference.

The President and his colleagues, Ettore Brelingger, is to the most outspoken critic of Russian monopoly, both as it concerns his "intervention" in Czechoslovakia, and its propaganda against Mao, must therefore, be related to these expectations. In a word, there is more opportunity than courage in the way the "dissenters" are at the Moscow conference. This becomes especially clear in his speech on May where he, at one and the same time, criticized Chinese Communism and opened Russia's attempt to "communicate." Mao from the world movement. Ettore Brelingger's speech on Czechoslovakia was the most outspoken one at the Moscow conference.

He may also have been under the illusion that the Italian CP had influenced the delay of this conference from the date it was supposed to have taken place—November 1968—after a date altogether too close to the Russian invasion. The more likely reason, however, is that Brezhnev needed the time to create a handful of Czechoslovak delegates.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA VS. MAO

Gustav Husak, who feels the need to speak with the spokesmen of the Russian invasion by, first, dutifully repeating what Hadi Pravda had written about the "wrong attitude" of Communist Parties in the West being based on "distorted facts and false information, handed out to them by counter-revolutionary journalists and even by some top-party officials," now that either the new allegedly "undistorted facts, nor the pre-conference appeal that the "communist" should not attend the "party affair," batted criticisms: this interval into Quisling dared to speak lovingly about the Russian occupation of his native land. Czechoslovakia, he said with a flourish, was bound "by ties of Communist international brotherhood with the Soviet Union and the socialist countries." (6) To the disgust and dismay of the Czechs, the Quisling leader thereby embraced "the grabbers of their short-lived hopes." (7) But the Pavel, who is bound with those ties and revolutionary past is, surely in occupied Czechoslovakia. The victory of creating Quislings is a parable. To see the dimensions of Communist international brotherhood with the Soviet Union and the socialist countries (6) To the disgust and dismay of the Czechs, the Quisling leader thereby embraced "the grabbers of their short-lived hopes." (7) But the Pavel, who is bound with those ties and revolutionary past is, surely in occupied Czechoslovakia. The victory of creating Quislings is a parable. To see the dimensions of Communist international brotherhood with the Soviet Union and the socialist countries (6)

(To be continued)

(1) The most detailed quotations from Brezhnev's speech are in Richard Sutcliffe in The Times, June 10, 1969.


(3) Pravda, May 8; a few excerpts from it can be found in Paul. Wodtke’s article in the Christian Science Monitor, June 18, 1969.

(4) Quoted by Henry Kann in The N.Y. Times, June 10, 1969.

(5) The most knowledgeable analysis of the Quislings’ "Selbst in Prague" by Kamil Wider. The writer had been.
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Splintered World Communism

"I am a member of the Communist Party that will not be
beaten by Marxism-Leninism in the world, and I will not
be caught in the capitalist world trap."

— Mao Zedong

Part B

Mao Zedong dominates the Congress of the "world" Com-

munist Party that met in Moscow in 1936. The host of the

meeting was the Soviet Union. The event was much more

than a meeting to discuss the future of the world. It was

also a test of strength between the two major Communist

powers, the Soviet Union and China. Mao was determined
to assert the preeminence of China in the Communist

world. He believed that China's role was to lead the Com-

munist movement in Asia and the world. However, Stalin

was reluctant to cede this role to China. Stalin wanted to

control the Communist movement in China and prevent

Mao from becoming a threat to his rule.

The split in the Communist movement began with the

death of Lenin in 1924. This split was further exacerbated

by disagreements over the course of the revolution in

China, which Mao was leading. Stalin and his allies in the

Comintern were more inclined to support the urban pro-

letariat in China, while Mao believed that the rural peas-

ants were the key to victory.

The split became even more pronounced in the 1930s,

when Stalin began to purge his rivals and consolidate his

power. Stalin saw Mao as a potential threat to his rule,

and he began to undermine Mao's position in the Com-

munist movement.

The split came to a head in the late 1930s, when Stalin

began to pressure Mao to align with the Soviet Union

in the anti-fascist struggle. Mao refused to do so, and

this led to abreak in relations between the two countries.

Mao continued to lead the Chinese Communist move-

ment, while Stalin focused on consolidating his power in

the Soviet Union.

The split in the Communist movement had profound

implications for the world. It created a rift between the

two major Communist powers, which contributed to the

rise of fascism and the Second World War. The split also

had implications for the development of Communism

in Asia and the world. Mao's leadership in China was a

key factor in the success of the Chinese revolution and

in the development of a unique brand of Communism.

Mao's ideas and strategy were different from those of

Stalin, and this reflects the diversity of the Communist

movement. The split in the Communist movement was

a turning point in the history of the world. It led to the

rise of fascism and the Second World War, but it also

created a new force in the world, one that was unique

and different from the Soviet model. Mao's leadership

in China was a key factor in the success of the Chinese

revolution and in the development of a unique brand of

Communism.
Of all Mao’s perversion of “Marxism-Leninism,” none is so wretched as this one, for which he coined the phrase “the struggle against counter-revolutionary economists.” While Lenin first began his battle against the counter-revolutionaries, i.e., those individuals who thought that the trade union field only, reserving for themselves the field of politics, and that the trade union leaders were the only ones capable of fighting against “imperialist economists.” In all cases, the fight against “economists” was a fight against intellectuals, leaders, officials, etc. Out of all this, Mao’s so-called “anti-intellectual revolution” led to him to disregard the “sense and reason” of the masses, who alone could transform society.

Lenin held to his principle that Bolsheviki could only be true “proletarians,” in the Marxist sense, if they were opposed to the conditions of labor, and if they were willing to work for the emancipation of the working class. This was a true “proletarian” revolution, for those who fought against the conditions of labor. When Lenin wrote “Capital,” he was not just writing a book; he was writing against the conditions of labor, and he was fighting for the emancipation of the working class. This was a true “proletarian” revolution, for those who fought against the conditions of labor. When Lenin wrote “Capital,” he was not just writing a book; he was writing against the conditions of labor, and he was fighting for the emancipation of the working class.

A true “proletarian” revolution is not just a book; it is a fight against the conditions of labor. When Lenin wrote “Capital,” he was not just writing a book; he was writing against the conditions of labor, and he was fighting for the emancipation of the working class. This was a true “proletarian” revolution, for those who fought against the conditions of labor. When Lenin wrote “Capital,” he was not just writing a book; he was writing against the conditions of labor, and he was fighting for the emancipation of the working class.

A true “proletarian” revolution is not just a book; it is a fight against the conditions of labor. When Lenin wrote “Capital,” he was not just writing a book; he was writing against the conditions of labor, and he was fighting for the emancipation of the working class. This was a true “proletarian” revolution, for those who fought against the conditions of labor. When Lenin wrote “Capital,” he was not just writing a book; he was writing against the conditions of labor, and he was fighting for the emancipation of the working class.

A true “proletarian” revolution is not just a book; it is a fight against the conditions of labor. When Lenin wrote “Capital,” he was not just writing a book; he was writing against the conditions of labor, and he was fighting for the emancipation of the working class. This was a true “proletarian” revolution, for those who fought against the conditions of labor. When Lenin wrote “Capital,” he was not just writing a book; he was writing against the conditions of labor, and he was fighting for the emancipation of the working class.
Critique of Althusser's anti-Hegelianism

Dear A.R.,

Please forgive me for not commenting on "Constructivism and Overconstructivism" by Louis Althusser, which you sent me a while ago. It was not through lack of interest, but rather because I had to concentrate on my book in progress, Philosophy and Revolution. Then, when I finally did get to read it, I was so disappointed by the style of a man who had so long been held up as an "original thinker, a new young French philosopher" that I could not get on with it. I have even consolidated in writing this letter.

The two very different types of events prompt this letter. One is the fact that Louis Althusser has since become one of the leaders of a post-Stalinist trend within the French Communist Party, or at least has scored the Central Committee with his influence over young students and the possibility that whereas an outright Marxist "party" failed to get much of a following in France, a Marxist position that has a philosophical Allbatiernier turn may speak "sufficiently in French" as to win a following and split their intellectual patrimony. They have told him that, whereas he may continue his "appropriation" (freed in purely abstract discussions), he may not need to politics.

**THE SECOND, and to me, the more important reason for this note is you, that is to say, your continuing many-sided study of Marxism that is very obviously not for a "constructivist". I was told about the latest material you ordered. You have been sent my "Notes on Lenin's Philosophical Notebooks" and the American Walker pamphlet, and I hope that one day I will send you a copy. It is important, both for the work on the Russian economy, and for my own interest in the question. Althusser's "Rusia" is a State-Capitalist Society.

Moreover, it was, about 1941, I think it is important to use the term, and if I find that you do not use the same one, I will use "State Capitalism". Today, I will send you a copy. It is important, both for the work on the Russian economy, and for my own interest in the question. Althusser's "Rusia" is a State-Capitalist Society.

**NOW THEN, the Althusser essay, the very title of which I found intellectually absurd because it was not just a question of a non-economic approach, but rather to mention the fact that the word itself, over-determination, has Freudian origins. Remember that my colleague's essay is not only economics and vulgar Commodity but also "(non)materialist" (realist) science. In a word, all those who did not appreciate in full the meaning of history, as past, as present, as future; history, not as Althusser understands it as "the run of history... through the multi-epoch world of the superstructures" (p. 32), but history in Marx's sense of people, rulers and society, history, rewriting contradictions in life and not only in thought, and thereby developing the Marxist tradition.

Althusser, in typically intellectualist fashion, is too preoccupied with "infrastructure-suprastructure composition" (p. 31), much less so, the unfinished, Marx himself. What he, therefore, fails to see is that this reification of abstraction makes it all too easy, indeed, easy to confuse history, and that only as above interpret it, and thus he never confronts the living strata below, un-

(Continued on Page 7)
Above, what is it that Althusser really means to say with his phrase "guilty Hegelianism:" he doesn't bother to explain here precisely because he isn't so much interested in attacking "Hegel" as Lukacs as he is in attacking Marx's "Hegelianism." Oh, how liquid haunts these apologies for the State.

"I shall not evade the most burning issue," concludes Althusser: "it seems to me that either the whole logic of 'abolition' must be rejected, or we must give up any attempt to explain how the proud and generous Russian people here Stalin's crimes and repression with such resignation; how the Bolshevik Party could tolerate them; and how a Communist leader could order them." (p. 24)

Poor Hegel, he now gets blamed for Stalin's crimes! The logic of abolition, that is to say, the dialectic of transcendence, is to lead us, not to freedom, but to wholeness of Russian state-capitalism and if it doesn't, as it surely can't and won't, then we must "drive this phallic back into the night." (p. 25) End. No doubt Marx will help Althusser do just that; but Marx won't.

Yours,
Bayk

Oct. 1965
The needed American Revolution

By Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of Marxism and Freedom
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FOOTNOTE ON THE DETRACTORS OF LENIN

By Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of Marxism and Freedom

1979—the 100th Anniversary of Lenin’s Birth—is sure to see a new phase of the Stalinist conflict as the two state-capitalist giants calling themselves Communist vie with each other to grasp the revolutionary mantle of Lenin in order to cover up the reality of their respective exploitative systems. In this they will be aided not only by “Western” (private capitalist) ideologues who have always maintained that Stalinism should “legitimately” from Leninism, but also by some who, like Paul Mattick, consider themselves Marxists but have made a veritable profession of anti-Leninism.

The saddest aspect of the new outpouring of anti-Leninism is that some young revolutionaries themselves to be no more in their thought the moment they need to move from activity in philosophy. Thus, Daniel Cohen-Braq’s “fascist” is the main concern of the November Revolution in France, May, 1968, has found nothing new to say in his Obiter Dicta more than the fact that he is a “philosopher of revolution” (1), and “of dialectical and revolutionary theory and practice,” (2) which turns out, in the main to be that of Stalinism on the March (Pierré Chaillou), Paul Cardon, et cetera. Since these departures from Marxism and restatements of The Meaning of Stalinism (3) are being played up as “the left-wing alternative” to Stalinism, it becomes important to take issue with these detractors of Lenin. In this footnote I will limit myself to Cardon, but it is only because what he says here is representative of all.

THE ALLEGATION

“On a strange reason,” writes Cardon, “Marxists have long seen the achievement of working class power in terms of the conquest of political power. Real power, namely power over production in day-to-day life, was always ignored.” This criticism of Marx’s philosophy is but prelude to the hammer and sickle approach to Lenin who, Cardon claims, was “once more” in 1927 until his death that production should be organized from above along “state-capitalist lines.” (Emphasis added.)

I know of no greater lie, but, for the time being, we will let it stand in order to call attention to the foundation for the distribute. As proof of the slanderous statement, Cardon quotes from one of Lenin’s speeches, “The Immanent Tasks of the Soviet Government” (4) and then only those passages which relate to the possibility of utilizing the “Taylor system.”

Never mind that the Taylor system was never introduced in Lenin’s lifetime. Never mind that the “single” will was not a reference to foremen or managers of production. The point of contention is that in the first year of revolution when the discussion revolved around “single” vs. “collective” referred to parallelism in organization. Since the first national trade union organization arose only after the revolution, just as temporary committees and Soviets likewise laid claim to running production. Never mind the objective situation, the backwash of the economy, four years of imperialist war, civil war and countless economic revolutionary attacks which were still going on as the new workers’ state was struggling for its very existence. That speech was made when the state was but four months old. The reference to “single will” and “iron discipline” are irrelevant for Cardon to conclude “We believe these conceptions, this subjective factor, played an enormous role in the degeneration of the Russian Revolution...”

We can see today the relationship between the virus held and the later role of Stalinism.”

Cardon is standing everything on its head. So “subjective” factor could ever have produced an objective situation—the new state of capitalism. State-capitalism first arose during the World Depression, on the one hand, and, on the other, it caused its most mature form in Russia during the Five Year Plans and Stalin’s most interior Moscow Peace Treaties. (4)

Were we to respond to anything so idle as that a single article could cover up a period covering the great proletarian revolution in history, would it not be incumbent upon the analyst to first consider that article in its entirety? That speech consisted of mere, a great deal more than the passages single out for quotation.

LENIN’S OWN VOICE

“The task of the principal task of the proletariat is to be the positive or creative work of setting up an extremely intricate and subtle system of new organizational relationships extending to the planned production and distribution of the goods required for the existence of tens of millions of people. Such a revolution can be carried out only if the majority of the population, and primarily the majority of the workers, display independent historical creative spirit. By creating a new Soviet type of state, which gives the opportunity to all the workers and the masses of the oppressed to take an active part in the independent building of a new society, we solved only a small part of this difficult problem.” (5)

Footnote on the detractors of Lenin

The four-months old workers’ state was in a period of waiting for new outbreaks of the revolution, which is moving in the West at a painfully slow pace. And Lenin was hailing fast in the now universal, that he had elaborated on the eve of revolution in State and Revolution, that unless the bourgeois state was so thoroughly smashed that revolution was run by the whole proletariat “TO A MAN”; and the state without bureaucracy, without a standing army, without police, was adminis-tered by the whole population “TO A MAN,” there would be no socialist society. Three months after gaining power, Lenin repeated: (7)

“We wanted the workers themselves to draw up, from below, the new principles of economic conditions.”

Indeed Lenin was willing to let a single distinction

(Continued on Page 7)
sum up the difference between the Second International that had betrayed the workers and the new, Third International. This single distinction was that genuine Marxists "reduced everything to the conditions of labor." Lenin was concerned about how "they" the workers still were. They had not "yet become accustomed to the idea that they are the ruling class now." He looked on at "the workers...equal, violent, indignant, nervous." He urged the proletariat to be "the educated" which was done, he said, "the monumental separation of mental from manual labor." He urged upon this proletariat to be "brave, ardent, honest, industrious, disciplined, organized, work for the immediate emancipation of the working class from all exploitation!" He urged, upon this proletariat to be "brave, ardent, honest, industrious, disciplined, organized, work for the immediate emancipation of the working class from all exploitation!"

Lenin was not speaking only against "bourgeois" intellectuals. He was talking about Bolsheviks, his co-workers who told him in 1905 that they had an "appeal to the workers," the appeal was to the initiative of the masses from below. The famous trade union debate of 1905-1912 showed how desperately he worked towards this one truth, how he differed even on the question of designating Russia as a workers' state. His contention was that a precise description would show instead that the designation of "workers' state" was an "abstraction" while the reality was that it was a workers' and peasants' state "with bureaucratic distortions." In arguing against Trotsky's administrative mentality, Lenin insisted that the only assurance lies in the workers protecting their state is through giving them the freedom to protect themselves from the state:

"The entirely organized proletariat must protect itself and must utilize the workers' organizations for the purpose of protecting the workers from their own state." (10)

This was not just a visionary concept of a Marxist who has no state power. This was the demand of a Bolshevik who had state power, a demand that, if he understood, his Party, recognize that the workers' state can justify its existence only when the workers maintain their own non-state organizations to protect them from their own state. There is a veritable conspiracy between the Communists and the destroyers of Lenin to portray Lenin's concept of the Party as if Lenin had never changed his position from 1905 to his death. Since peace does not allow me here to deal with the question of "the revolution," which is fully enough, I must refer readers to Marxian and Freedom, Chapter XI, "Forms of Organization: the Relationship of the Spontaneous Self-Organization of the Proletariat to the "Vanguard Party."

References:
(1) "Opsest Blvd. of the Left: Alternative by Comrade Z. (9) (McGraw-Hill, N.Y.)
(2) "Solidarity Pamphlet No. 6 (London).
(3) Selected Works, Vol. VII, pp. 312, 313, 314
(4) For a full analysis of state-capitalism, see MARX, ENGELS AND FREEDOM, Chapter 3, "Russian State-Capitalism v. Workers' Revolt.
(5) Lenin was warning of the possible return to capitalism throughout the last two years of his life. Especially important on state-capitalism is his speech to the 11th Congress of the Party, Selected Works, Vol. IX, 322-371.
(8) Ibid. p. 9.

Dec. 1949
TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom
Chairman News & Letters Committee

Extracts from Raya Dunayevskaya's article "Economism vs. Marx's Humanism," which discusses the nature of Marx's work and the development of humanism in his writings. The article criticizes the "welfare state" and its limitations, emphasizing the role of human service and the examination of the "welfare state" concept. It highlights the contrast between Marx's humanist approach and the economistic view prevalent in some modern societies. The article concludes that Marx's humanism offers a more comprehensive understanding of society and its development.
of the classical economists". Mattick comments: "Even though Marx accepted and developed Ricardo’s value theory, he was not the ‘prophet’ of the classical economists, but their adversary." (p. 28)

Here he himself draws a sharp distinction between narrow communism and Marx’s concept of the "life process of society’s human creative potential of production." Nor does Mattick limit his criticism to Ricardo, but extends it to revolutionary Marxist. Thus, he hits out against "His argument about reducing Marx’s material conception of history to the value theory: ...the materialist conception of history is not identical with the labor theory of value. It discloses social development in general, of which capitalism is only a special case." (p. 29)

Nor, Mattick continues, is it "merely a question of conscious as against unconscious regulation." (p. 30)

The law of value and, indirectly, inter alia, the law of surplus value, apply to capitalist societies and only to them.

It is true Mattick conveniently slips over my exposé of Ricardo’s own break with Marx’s theory of value in 1835 at the time it happened. But, at least in 1899, he does write of it. It helps him place the same Paul Sweezy’s analysis of Russian pre-capitalism as if stabilization of industry plus "the principle of planning" was all that is needed to establish "socialism." While, Mattick hits away at realist and Communist economists, he himself does not break out of economics’s confines in the full tradition of the revolutionary Marx who didken: the separate philosophical assumption that his Promethean vision of a classless society united, instead of divided, materialization and idealism into that new human dimension he called "a thoroughgoing Naturalism or Humanism."

WHAT IS PHILOSOPHY?

So foreign, in Mattick, is the integrity of Marx’s philosophy that he concludes that he makes a total hash out of Marx’s original economic categories. Mattick forces into identity Marx’s split of political economic category of value into labor, capital, and concrete labor, and the further singling out from labor, as activity, its economic category of value, its economic category of labor-power. Where Marx speaks of the two-factor character of labor, Mattick "replaces" it as "the two-person character of labor." (p. 25)

The obscurity of Mattick to Marx’s philosophical analysis — the all-pervasive fetishism of commodity bundles literally calls for him to make such value identification as it may. Indeed, the commodity rather than what he claims which "produces" value and surplus value. The two-factor character of the commodity-value and surplus-value is of course only the phenomenal expression, the "secret" of the commodity’s relationship at the end of production, all of which Mattick "knows" very well. Then why attempt, with a single stroke of the pen, to destroy with the fetishism of commodities by identifying Marx’s analysis of labor, as activity, with labor-power as commodity?

Had the mature Mattick followed Marx into the labor theory of value himself he would have avoided the commodity fetishism analysis, not only by desiring the two, but also by perverted the ‘commodity fetishism’. Indeed, of the four volumes of Capital, the volumes away at this capitalistic perversion — the reification of labor, the transformation of the labor into the abstraction of value — are just the result of the workers against this.

Doubtless, for the knowledgeable Paul Mattick, the commodity-form holds no secrets; labor and labor-power may appear anonymous to one who doesn’t feel the full weight of the capitalistic perversion of subject to object, of man into mere appendage to machine, of the transferred labor into the abstraction of value. But Marx, after laboring more than a decade with the exposition of the fetishism of the commodity-form which, on the surface, appeared as simple as that all "took it for granted" as still dissipated even after the first edition of Capital was published in 1857.

It was only after the workers had shown themselves anew as creative "authors", and not merely as exploited "subordinates", by "storming the heaven" and creating a totally new form of workers’ labor—the Paris Commune: and only after Marx himself analyzed this greatest revolution of his lifetime—the Civil War in France—that he again reported that most famous section of Chapter 1, "The Principle of Commodities" in the French edition of Capital, 1872-75. Only then was he finally satisfied with the comprehensiveness of the answer to the question: Where does the fetishism of commodities? "From the form itself." The whole point was that not only is the form "fetishistic" that makes "social relations appear as material relations between things" but that, under capitalism, that is what "they really are."

Without full comprehension of this philosophy, Mattick ends, not only by asporing what Marx had unfolded —philosophy and economics—but, inseparably, isolates himself from the voices from below in his era and thus falls prey to Keynes. This is so, not because he doesn’t, as a Marxist economist, criticize Keynes as bourgeois. It is so because, in his preoccupation with Keynes, he proceeds undisturbed by proletarian attitudes to the decades from the 1890’s to the end of the 1900’s; that is to say, from the Depression to the technological revolutions culminating in Automation.

The result is that his only "original" category for world economic development of our era is "mixed economy." Even the concept of state-capitalism becomes subordinated to the "bureaucracy" of the mixed economy. No wonder he falls such easy prey to the Keynesian "revolution" in economics that he reverses himself to make it fit the economic theories of Keynes. "Though carried out in the name of Marx," writes Mattick (referring both to the 1937 Revolution and to the imperialist adventures of post-Second Russian Bolshevism, as well as the African Revolutions) which broke out spontaneously, "is the most characteristic of the mixed capitalist or state socialist revolutions would be better described as a "Keynesian revolution." (p. 217)

MATTICK’S HOSTILITY TO THE PROLETARIAT

We have no time to waste on exposing such a fantastic turning upside down of actual social revolutions, which produced phenomenon in bourgeois economics, not to mention Mattick’s retelling of history so that Keynes, which Marx recognized as the 1900’s nevertheless "fits" 1937. What is of importance is that he has failed to see the depth of the antiprolletarian "philosophy" which, both objectively and subjectively, does not fit in with state-capitalism and "working class" idealism as well as with all who have departed from Marxism.

Like all of them, he abuses Marx’s vision of the revolutionary nature of the proletariat—"The proletariat is revolutionary or it is nothing" —in order not to load his hostility to the proletariat: "At present it (the proletariat) is nothing." (p. 277)

This anti-proletarian attitude that is his one true "philosophy", be it in his analysis of Marx whom he is supposed to be following, or of Keynes whom he is supposed to be opposing, be it in his anti-proletarian nationalism or his deliberately ambiguous disregard of the African Revolution, it is this hostility to the proletariat that has caused the profound decay of one of the principal foundations of the philosophy of the proletariat in the 20th Century.
By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom
(I am happy to print in my column this letter the following letter I just received from a worker-colleague...

TO MOST intellectuals who live and think in every country, from the real world, the struggles and the culture of the oppressed (either fighting imperialism of a so-called “mother country” or the class struggle within a country). Thus their whole life is superficial and abstract, since in the real two worlds of culture, science and humanities are one and the same.

But this is not surprising, really, when one considers that whatever intellectuals bring up the struggle of oppressed and this is exactly what two-worlds-mom-is, a battle of contradictions: and their way of life, the class struggle, national struggle, it is an objective movement through contradictions, but a petty-bourgeois “criticism” and “criticism” thing of the.

This is the effect of a par with Stalin, who reduced Russian intellectuals to “suffice criticism” and real criticism for the Hegelian dialectic, and Mao who said that contradictions can be “be” things—if you have the thoughts to guide you. All of this is true, for as Marx said, you can’t have one base for life and another for science or in this case philosophy, which is the science of thought. But none of the intellectuals and Mao among them, try their hardest to do it. In spite of the dialectical law that proves you can’t divorce theory from practice, i.e., real life, the class struggle.

And this is exactly what many intellectuals, like the intellectuals, are doing. They are developing theories all over the place and even adopting those that have already been shown to be counter-revolutionary and anti-working class, without once holding or listening to the voices of those who will make the actual revolution. A prime example of what I am talking about are the Weathermen, who exist not only in a theoretical but in a real world of their own.

So here too it can clearly be seen that “Two Worlds” exist, the intellectuals and “statistical” one, and the struggling masses in the other.

I could never understand why so many intellectuals I’ve met didn’t get the meaning of the title “Two Worlds” or why it was so little attention to the culture. Writing this letter, however, has made clear to me the why of it. As the Cheka brothers say...

Vive la Raza...
African revolutions at the crossroads

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom

The latest news from Nigeria speaks about one bright spot—the re-emergence of political opposition forces, specifically a Marxist party, Socialist Workers party, under Dr. Ojukwu and the trade union movement led by Waliab Goodluck. This is very good news indeed, but we must also remember that it is only those forces who refused to answer the question: what happens after? at the time, in May 1962, when I discussed with them the question of the African Revolution at the crossroads. With this in mind I am reproducing the Political Letter I wrote from Africa at that time, and I would also ask our readers to read the back issues of News & Letters, especially the report by a Nigerian in June-July 1962: an exclusive report from Ghana, August-Sept. 1963; and my own article in April 1963, "Nigerian-Humanism, Africa and America: Why a New International," which was also printed in Presence Africaine.

Dear Friends,

There is hardly a day one spends in Africa, especially West Africa, when one isn’t torn by such conflicting emotions that he is both at a loss for words and so full of them that every word, literally, has a double meaning. You come to Nigeria and see that this reality has been no exception, just a change in administration. You, therefore, listen, inspire, in opposition, the Nigerian Youth Congress, the "left" of the trade unions that talk of "foreign gold" and wish to break with KGB, the young Hausa rebels that talk of how the emirs still rule the North, with "Zark" help—"the same Zark who had been in the forefront of the continental revolution long before all other "lefts"—Nkurumah, Tshaye, Kalu—ever dreamed of nationalism. Then, suddenly, you hear the "solution"—follow the example of Ghana, the single party state, Ojukwu will lead, never mind Europe, what is London to us here where Britain holds on, Americana here is, and even the American Negro does not stint in return to his "homeland"—your heart sinks.

You come to Ghana, and at first you are thrilled, compared to Lagos, Accra is clean, with white bookshelves where but yesterday there was bush, and the general public does feel it has had more than a change of Administration; there has been a genuine political revolu-

tion. Then you pick up the press—and the situation of Ojukwu, the "Leader," "One Light," "the All-knowing," "the Father of not only our country but all of Africa," "Nkurumah, our philosopher, our politics, our life, and our song," alles klar all over again, as if you were watching the Kremlin in the heyday of Stalin, "the son of the Himalayas.

YESTERDAY is so deeper into the workers’ realm—those that struck and had to retreat, work overtime without pay "to make up for lost time during post-colonial strike" and now must also, out of their small wages, pay 3 per cent to 10 per cent away in forced savings—and then you meet some in education who refused to have classes in "Nkurumah’s" offices at least a pamphlet was produced that told them what it is in black and white, not just in empty oratory; finally you hear the whisper, "Of course, you can’t tell Ojukwu, but Ghana is allowed as a country to live in, their technicians are too expensive to keep and not half as efficient as they would be like you in West Africa; as for the love the Jus-
these are supposed to have for the Africans, forget it, it isn’t there."

By the time you hear that Nkurumah is also calling back the head of the United Africa Co.—the very one against whom, back in the 60’s, the strikers were held and the revolution unendurable—to bring about "higher labor productivity and efficiency," you are ready to write Ghana off, too. Then you meet a South African black who has come for all and gotten it, a Gabonese who has left a single library or bookstore in town, not just reading, but literally "eating up" all books on Marx, easily available here, and once again you are torn apart.

You try especially hard to see the positive aspects of Pan-Africanism in the best example of it—Scheu Tshaye’s Guinean. Here the press is not so full of the "cult of personality." Rather the spontaneous questions from Tshaye are on a theoretical plane—and he has, not just an ego like Nkurumah’s, but a theory of "Total Re-Africanization" so that the single party state is pul-

You try especially hard to see the positive aspects of Pan-Africanism in the best example of it—Scheu Tshaye’s Guinean. Here the press is not so full of the "cult of personality." Rather the spontaneous questions from Tshaye are on a theoretical plane—and he has, not just an ego like Nkurumah’s, but a theory of "Total Re-Africanization" so that the single party state is full of life and not in the smallest valley closed. In the airport, or at the Ministry of Information, there is the white French CP who means you up in a moment, reforms a visa or follows your every move with such suspicion that even if you had your African-speaking friends who helped you to get down to the people, you really couldn’t find out much.

And the breach with the Russians and demand that Russian ambassador be recalled as responsible for stirring up the post-colonial strife? Well, if the Rus-
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Africans—you know someone in every part of that continent. Next, West North South and South has a sense of communication with him. 

Africa, my Africa, how the imperialists have divided you up, measured and enslaved, robbed you of iron and soil, left you with neither rains nor clothes, and illiterate, all illiterate—what of the thousands of years of history you can recount if you cannot today read the latest law of the land that tells you you cannot read foreign—foreign—and who are these Britshers if not foreign literature—old words, "propaganda-bred hatreds." 

Well, you are back in stride with your African friends and can say with that wonderful Mandela who sticks close to his "leader," "Caressed, imperialism, colonialism—I don't like it. Out, out, out. I want my freedom, my land, and I'll work from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. for nothing to restore its richness."

THEN COMES the rude awakening: yes, what of the role of labor? Of course, you hear, we are for labor; we have no other class, but if the unions dare to mix in politics, we ask our members to withdraw their membership. And the unions say, sure, we aren't given credit for it but it was our strike that precipitated constitutional reform, but now that we're facing self-government, the workers have no right to always want to strike.

You return to reason with the intellectual but you get no different answers from those out of power than those in B. Start let's get the imperialists out, then we'll talk of which road the Pan-Africans ride; you cannot speak of "what after," when we haven't even got independence; oh yes, I read about Hungary, and even the East German wall, but Russia is not our enemy. Tricky last, well, you can betray again: the world? my world, my Africa, is there for us, and they need only which means single party, we need to industrialize which means using both sides so. I'm not asking the price; that, too, can be talked about later, later, later.

SUDDENLY YOU FEEL you have no common language after all. You thought it was the philosophy--Marxism? But who wants to begin seeing differences between Marxism and Communism? Ah, the youth—you, the wonderful youth you, God knows we are so low, who it was through Ghana or Guinea, God preserve them all—still I'm here to talk about your revolution, talked most knowingly of everything from "corruption value" (I swear it) to Abolition, African socialism, humanism—the future, the really true, new human world. Yes, the youth and the elders—another revolution is on its way.

May 30, 1942

Raya

P.S. The pull of the two nuclear powers is not only over the domination over Africa—and neo-colonialism is a fact, but a dead hero the African elders keep beating for propaganda purposes at UN sessions—above all, it is a serious position for the peace-making, world state of production, stabilized production in its full or "free enterprise" stage. This is not the trap of the African Revolution where the deepening has gone so deeply down with the consequences to this development so that they cannot have that sort of thing in the end even if it is the country, your own country, the one that belongs to its people. For Africa the Africans.

But I prefer to this letter not to talk in the cold language of economic loss even though production relations are so deep and decisive as any talk of stagnation. For let's first of all necessary for the white to get the better hands, Africans to take it to his own as it is said. Together then, let us not a common solution of hazards and future take steps that will not separate technologically advanced from technologically underdeveloped. So let's trace statistics for another time—R.

March 1970
TWO WORLDS

By Rayna Danyevskaya

The U.S. President's strike-breaking order to U.S. troops to take the jobs away from U.S. postal workers brings in a militaristic galloping totalitarianism that is pernicious to U.S. life.

The creeping, and not-to-creeping, totalitarianism that now pervades every facet of American life discloses, day-by-day, and day-out, not only the abysmal degeneracy of American capitalism in general—that is to say, in its exploitative, imperialist, police state returns—but also, and especially, in that of our intellectual sloth. It takes no time at all for the thin veneer of democracy to turn into instant-racism.

INSTANT RACISM

The no sooner did the American Gesta-type police, in the dark of the night, with shot guns blazing and tear gas making it impossible for humans to exist, raid the Black Panthers Headquarters in Chicago,Williamsburg and Washington, D.C. student occupiers, than the intellectual-in-residence at the White House, Patrick Muphan, fired a shot across the President about the "extra-ordinary progress" of the Negro in the United States of America.

- He played informer also on a petty level—Mr. Muphan's "bravado" extends to reading the mindless of society columnists—that making it possible for him to inform the Commander-in-Chief of the most important army in the world that Mr. Leonhard Bernadotte had held a party to raise money for the defense of the Black Panthers. The society group was part and parcel of the district against New Yorkers who might consider black revolutionaries "culture heroes" instead of "pro-cleaning" haters of whites. Haunted, one is against whites is now an acceptable canard for doing what might have been done anyway.

- Daniel Patrick Muphan, it may be objected, is not characteristic of the liberal intellectual breed. After all, he betrayed his "liberal" Democratic Party colleagues by accepting an high post with a conservative Republican President who he now has, Cabinet rank. O.K., let's take some Democratic Party liberals who are not on Nixon's payroll, and who even opened the door to the Democratic Party, or to Senator Ritterhoff.

Totalitarianism: U.S. Style

Just last year, at the Democratic Convention, Sen. Ritterhoff praised Mayor Daley's anti-busing remarks and helped expose the Gestapo-type Chicago police who connived, and staged the riots for which the anti-Vietnam war protesters have been railroaded to jail. This year, the same Ritterhoff found no better way to express Northern hypocrisy on school desegregation than to team up with that Southern racist senator from Minnesota.

The INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE FOR RACISM

Moreover, this is no exception to, but is a part of, very nearly the whole "educated world" who have chosen this moment when Southern white mobs overturn school buses, endangering the lives of black school children, to declare that it is "indeed" time for some "foreign agent" of Negroes, time "to return to quality education." Nor can we forget that the climate for overcontrolled buses and threatened school children was created by the President himself when he cut against the backs of children to integrate schools.

The "intellectual climate" created by those who have portrayed "quality education" can be gleaned both from the arrogant racism of white middle-class America, and its white but instead of any revolutionary youth, white, black or red or yellow. Thus, when asking to comment on the unalterable Agnew's dictates about "sneaky and demagogic and social media who ought to be brought in with butterfly nets," the outraged Muphan had the gall to reply: "I think the reference was to Harvard students and I have analogues and cullipic and evasive views on them."

What is not "amalgamating," nor "complex," much less "representative" is the type of theads leading which, in the first place, permitted the lawless "race" amendment to be passed by the L.A. "Great Society" Civil Rights Bill. What is not "amalgamating," or "complex," much less "representative" is the militaristic climate created by the Mayor, who now endorses Jerry Brown, as well as Southern, backhandedly, and 

(Continued on Page 1)
trated to the Vietnam war atrocities (which some commentators believe presidential non-action in response to the ensuing, dirty, imperialist war), the despicable outwitting of and bid to the poor, whether it be for food or education, more subject to any instant, or any other kind of diminution.

The "(unnamed"
lower phenomenon called the American totalitarianism"
also has all of the phoniness of Russian"
so wishes. And the audience
is something De Gaulle couldn't conjure up in his stage
piece conferences. When the notion or Chinese
or Citizen-isms of state talk to the mass media, it is
called "nonsensational." When it is done in the U.S. in
good "show biz" manner, it passes for "direct contact
with the people." By whatever name, it smacks to high
degree of totalitarianism.

GALLOPING TOTALITARIANISM

"Crassness" being forced through Congress is the most
authoritative bill ever enacted in the U.S. The infamous
1970 Allen and Aid-Section 402, in which the present
crime bill Crimm bill is being compared, passes by
nomination. Not only will Americans be deprived of
every constitutional right in the First Amendment
granting free speech through the Fifth Amendment,
providing the accused against self-incrimination. But
we will also be subjected to a new-age, on-the-door,
violation of privacy—and this is being done by a societal
crime, under a"
ized, electronic--device structures
which would yesterday have been inconceivable in the
middle ages. All this is being planned off as necessary
to fighting crime.

This isn't creeping totalitarianism, it is full blown
at full speed ahead toward a police state. Already, the
policemen are taking the rights away. You needn't be
black, or a youth with beard hair. You just have to be stopped
for" or "commit" what some traffic violations, have the" of
or a way by which you are stopped, and you will be
even be subjected to.toLocaleString() in a way not was most profi
cular to do.

If giving a state of mind has already become the
invasion of the minds, which banned for justice in the U.S.
At the present time, Justice William in New York is
voting with that bill from the State House of Congress, the unbridled wishes of the courts and the police of courts for any state of mind—be it a
plane police power, law
in the San Francisco-War
garoo courts, or holding a sign "power to the people"
violating every right, including the freedom of creativity and carried
off to jail.

TOTALITY OF LIBERATION

Let's take a second look at the state of mind of our
inhabitants—1. Don't mean the Mainliner, or the
Cold War, warlike, of the McCarthyists, of the McCarthysts, but the
"underground" middle-class, middle-class, cut to the heart, the fear of a
kicking social-acceptable. Each one has his favorite story
about the hypocrisies of the black power of the day, the way of "infringement by J. Edgar Hoover." Each one has
also a lot of grumblings about the "nancy and weakness" of the black folk who "talk all of the time," "where
is that thing," "and off in books, making noises about
nothing." What is the reaction of the black literary groups?
All of which is true;

about the need of American or to be.

Totalitarianism, creeping or "sneaking," certainly begins
in the" of a police state even if it can still permit the luxury
of the madmen who refuse to run in 1972 because "I won't go:
for the police state but to have security for our people. It may
be necessary." How much that sounds like the American
military in Vietnam which declared that "in order to save
Hitler we had to destroy it."

To put it differently, all that either the claims of
the intellectuals or the George Wallace or the VFW com-
manders amount to is that the U.S. may very well be
the first country where fascism will get in by the back
door. The only thing that will guarantee "I" is that the
black, and better, too, as they feel the breath of degen-ate state-capitalism, will prefer the road by revolution
rather than the steps to political totalitarianism. If
the willingness of the U.S. postal workers has added
an entirely new dimension in the struggle against the
government which has set the working classes to total-
itarian vice. At the same time that they are being
outraged and the sentiment of the 90% of the population, they
are being called against their own tradition leadership.
They have forced all the ability of those who have accepted
the white-hat-black-as-a "law" to confront the power of
black-white, with solidarity. No matter how the great
strike is reached, there is not a single trace of the
American pollution, that can any longer be taken for
granted at: neq-pie,promotion, etc.

April 1970
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production, but "in adequacy . . . of monetarily effective demand." (p. 263)

Bourgeois authors love to harry in the market and concentrate on money rather than go into the factory and concentrate on relations of men at the point of production. Nevertheless, this departure from Marx's theory of crises would not, in and of itself, have obliterated the feeling of stasis among the bourgeois economists. Other Marxists, from the great revolutionary martyr, Rosa Luxemburg, to the post-Marxist economist, Paul Sweezy, have made similar unconscionable departures from Marx's strict production theory of crises without having brought such high recognition for criticism and objectivity.

The departure from a strict production theory to a market analysis not been followed by the strictly capitalistic (private, and state-capitalist) curricula, that state-induced "monetary effective-demand" acts as a stabilizer of the economy, praise would not have been so lavish. In a word, what produced the euphoria among bourgeois reviewers was that final market plunge by Mandel, who (after another 200 pages of "data") based his model on his study of, for example: "The capitalist economy of this phase tends to insure greater stability, both of competition and of expenditure . . . " (p. 359). (We will return to this point later).

TODAYNESS AND METHODOLOGY

So determined is Mandel not "to restitute" himself to following the dictatorial structure of "the chapters" of Capital that he forces himself to thinking that it is not a departure from the dictatorial methodology, but only from the data in these "chapters" (written in the last century) (p. 17). However, if one turns out to be also disregards Lenin's criticism, which is very much of the 20th century.

In a word, this is not merely a question of updating statistics, and of starting "from the empirical data of the science of today." Chapters 2 and 12-"Monopoly Capitalism" and "Imperialism." As opposed to the latest statistics and the author's wide readings are here a great "state" model, relevant than that Marx or "methodology" or "decontextualization" which reveal the Western type by concentrating on the primitive.

"Historical Materialism" is a work that is supposed to explain "Marxist Economic Theory" is a work that is supposed to explain the development of society in relation to the material substratum. Mandel, by his very nature, has absorbed the starting point of Marx's theoretical foundation as the 'real' categories of the capitalist production.
"Two Worlds": True rebirth or wholesale revision of Marxism?

(Continued from Page 5) analysis of the law of value which Marx considered the cornerstone of capitalism, but which Mandel, following the Russian economists, stripped of its strictly capitalistic nature.

This is not just a question of an "beginning" with what Marx began his analysis—the famous Chapter I of Capital with which Louis had accused "most of the Marxists"—of understanding because they had not understood "the whole of the Epoch." Nor is it a question of beginning, indeed, with what is now in the epoch on which analyses and analyzing. Rather it is an act of presenting capitalistic economic categories as if they had always existed—long before capitalism and long after capitalism is abolished. The Russians were lazy, bands on capitalism in order to attempt to obviate the naked exploitation of their state-capitalist society in "new" Marxist manner. Why does Mandel do it—keep silent?

The Russians (15 years) before they could write as if that had always been the interpretation of Marxian economics. Mandel begins where they always were. This is not because Mandel is the brilliant one. The Russians have a 15 year priority in that field. But the Communist state-capitalists had in, first—sum the direct orders of Stalin—made the admission that they were changing "the leading" of Marxism political economy. They then had to make sure that the trade prior to 1945 did not a "disappearing act" in order, from then on, to begin writing without further ado about the "orthodox" perspective of the "whole of value." Above all, they had to work out the consequences of the break with the structure of capital which reveals not only the exploitative nature but also the perversion of capitalism: The machine is master of man, which gives rise to the fetishistic appearance of commodities and presents the relations between men as if they were mere exchange of things.

Then, and only then, could the Russian theoreticians, Stalinized and "orthodox," write as if the startling 1945 revision was "Marxism." It isn't that the erudite Mandel didn't "read" the controversy. Rather, the line of memory was planned for purposes of presenting a "true rebirth." After Stalin's death, and especially after the effects of Khrouchtchev's reforms had been exhausted. Soviet economic thought underwent a "true rebirth." (p 226).

TO BE CONTINUED (All footnotes will appear at the end of Part II, next issue.)

"Another Mandel happened to have been the person who debated me in 1947 when I presented the theory of state-capitalism, which I was the first to work out from original Soviet sources on the basis of the first three Five Year Plans, when the Russians were still abusing the operation of the law of value in their "socialist" land." (Assadour, of the Russian Economy, New International, Dec, 1947, Feb, 1948, May, 1948, Feb, 1945, and again in Dec. 1946 and Jan. 1947, and after World War II, analyzed the Fourth Five Year Plan, "New Developments in Stalin's Russia in Labor Action, October 1945") Following that experience of the Fourth International, the French Traiington theoretical journal of which Mandel was an editor, published my article on the Varga controversy. (Quartiere Internationale, January-February, 1945.)
Two Worlds of Capitalism

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom

Part II

(Continued from last issue)

Ernest Mandel paid only scant attention to the fact that Russian economists had "for a long time" debated the "arrivals of capitalist enterprises" in the USSR. (The assumption made by Mandel is that Russia is not characteristic of capitalism, and only capitalism, production relations.)

This attempt to cover his tracks after his failure to deal with the startling 1960 revision of the Marxist law of value cites meetings of academician, "totally ... in 1951, in Dec. 1956, and in June 1958." The post-1949 Vava controversy was not an unnotable event. Since, however, his memory coincided extended back only to 1951, he also manages to ignore it.

Yet that involved the entire staff of the Institute of World Economics which Enam Vava headed.

Changes in the Political Economy of Capitalism Reaching from the Second World War, Enam Vava, raised the crux question as near to the heart of Mandel: the possibility that state intervention; even under private capitalism, could prevent economic crisis. And, for a moment, the issue in dispute extended itself to the problem Lenin first posed during World War 1, of state-capital, a question that Mandel avoids like the plague. (51)

Our concern with Mandel's studied disregard of the Russian revisions, as well as of the theory of state-intervention, is not for purposes of expose. Although it explores this claim to objectivity, to a "scientific" analysis, it is not Mandel's substantiation of a moment. What is at issue is the one-track nature of his economic theories which rests on the illusion that the state intervention in the economy, "is an... revolutionary measure to a reliable capitalism" (p. 541).

Moreover, this has led Mandel to a change in tools for the proletarian rather than "the state of capitalism" which, nevertheless, reestablishes the working risk to interest in the management of enterprises and the regulation of the economy as a whole... (p. 504)

The Class Struggle and the Plan

Because Mandel doesn't see today's problems, nor does Marx's general analysis of the crisis, the class struggle—exists only as something possible that deals with class struggle... (p. 505)

He brings with abuse in from Spartacists to Attila Arno and in fact in China, but it is not the case that he is científico in 1951 (p. 178). The crux of the thesis is Mandel's thesis about the first recorded strike in history, that's of "Egyptian workers were working, indeed 1500 N.C., under Stalinist III, at Drezdenkow, on the west bank of the Nile, near Tidum" (p. 178, 176). He then turns into the peasant revolt in China. And when we see the first strike in China, 1938, i.e. not to relate, not to Europe which has been up to, by the 1948 proletarian revolutions, but to Japan, inset by peasant revolts for 250 years: the "first proletarian insurrections occurred between 1903 and 1932" (p. 176).


As doubtless this sounded very revolutionary to Mandel. It isn't one of Marx's most famous statements, "All history is the history of class struggle." The trouble with Mandel is that the working class exists for him, not as subject, but as object, his program makes back out of both theory and history of the universal and the concrete, and, most of all, at the class struggle and the plan. It seems to be totally unaware of the fact that, whereas the new state of economy is grasped in rivalry relationship in the struggle of the workers, not the争夺 of property; the crisis at each stage of production which is in need of solution is "etched" invidiously, that is to say, through new ways of extracting more unpaid hours of labor.

This "technical trap" waits for Marxists who fail to see that the workers' struggle today in "the plan" is due to the workers' superior knowledge, that is what "hastily" the Marxists is, in fact, the undirected authority of the capitalists. Private or state, the Marxist state is a "dead" man on the line, through plant managers (and including political economists), as in the case of the Nationalized plant.

In Mandel, however, even when he deals with the present epoch, and though he describes it as one of "bureaucratic stagnation" (p. 501), state intervention still acts as "unclouded." And so great are the powers of state intervention (ties, of course, the estimated workers' ability to extract a rise in real wages that it serves Mandel as a part of a transition point to the Stalinist economy, which he declares "does not display any of the fundamental aspects of capitalist economy" (p. 500). The falsification of stifled economy holds him a prisoner to such an extent that he even supposes, as necessary, "regulated primitive accumulation" (p. 501).

He does admit, that, at least in the distributive sphere, the Russian economy has "the effect of the characteristic of the phenomenon of inequality of the norms of payment for work that exists in the USSR." (p. 504). That is to say, it is OK for wages to be poor, poorer even than under private capitalism, whether in the condition of the worker, and even the existence of "the system of forced labor camps" (p. 507) seems to dissipate Mandel's prose of nationalized property as "transitional to socialism."

As we see, Mandel's silence on the matter of the theoretic revisions wasn't worth a question of theory. In the case of failure—unless the economists in the relations of men at the point of production which came to full theoretical bloom in the plan of Marx's greatest work, Capital.

The most telling consequence of the revisions of the Russian law of value, inferior as Mandel's work under private capitalism.

Crisis

On the one hand, Mandel goes to great lengths to expose Marx's central point about crisis—the decline in the rate of profit. He illustrates well the question of the rate of profit and the rate of exploitation of surplus labor, plus variable capital, or labor power. Since constant capital plus fixed costs, variable capital, plus surplus value comes from variable capital only, there is no way to escape the decline in the rate of profit.

The most convincing consequence—here's the growth of the mass of profits, the increasing productivity of labor, the capital output little capital—all allow the capitalists to increase the mass of profits and the fall of the decline in the rate of these profits. But that
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overriding, contradictory fact of capitalist production doesn't "do away" the cyclical crises keep recurring to prove that there is no escape from the ultimate reckoning of capitalist production as a production of values and surplus values, accumulation and expansion of surplus values, without which capitalist production stops.

On the other hand, as we've indicated previously, Marx says, at the same time, that it is the "lack of numerically effective demand" which is the cause of crisis. He also holds that the view that expanded labor is able to gain a substantial increase in real wages at the expense of capital's extraction of surplus value, that is to say, even when there is no rise in the productivity of labor, is therefore false. Another Marx's principle that the diminution of unpaid labor can never reach a point at which it would threaten the system itself... Accumulation is the independent, not the dependent, variable." 16

**DEVIATIONS**

This does not end Mandel's deviation from Marx's theory of crises. He also holds that the "fundamental contradiction of the age of capitalist decline" is the "contradiction of over-capitalization" (p. 53), as if the failure to increase its real production were not insufficient profitability at the point of production, but lack of markets. He supplemented in Mandel with the reiteration of bourgeois political economy in market mechanisms that he falls prey even to the spurious "multiplier" and "accelerator" principles.

Obviously, he has read alongside too many books by bourgeois economists on the market phenomena of crises. Contrary to bourgeois economists, however, he has a guilty conscience about remaining so long with the epiphenomenal. He unwisely reproaches them for ignoring the law of uneven development which, to him, is not only "a universal law of human history" (p. 94), but also the key to crises.

There is one thing he has failed to note. This "new" way of expressing the disproportionality between the two main departments of production—means of production and means of consumption—is the very problem that Marx deliberately excluded from consideration. This was so, not because Marx didn't know if as a fact of production but because it isn't the key to crises. On the contrary, it would have diverted from the importance of the problem: exploitation of labor by capital through the instrumentality of the machine. That is to say, the payment of labor at value (the minimum it takes to maintain him and reproduce his kind), the extraction from him of the maximum of unpaid hours of labor through the ever greater expansion of machinery and ever decreasing wage, relatives, of living labor.

No wonder that the bourgeois reviewers were so pleased with Mandel's view of the market mechanisms: he's calling it "stabilization." Mandel wanted to synthesize the overproduction, underconsumption, disproportionality theories of crises with Marx's, which is related strictly to the law of value and surplus value. But as Marx said of Proudhon, "He wishes to be a synthesis, he is a complex error."(17)

---

JUNE-JULY, 1970

EDITORIAL ARTICLE

NIXON'S WARS AT HOME AND ABROAD

By Rayo Delyamreyia, National Chairman,
News & Letters Committee

Inseparable from Nixon's April 30 speech about the invasion of Cambodia is the preventive civil war he is unleashing against the American people. His excuse is an ominous one: "We live in an age of anarchy both abroad and at home." Nixon's call for attacks against the antiwar movement as well as against the oppositionists to his whole strategy of war, recession, and racism, became all too obvious in the massacres at Kent, Ohio, on May 4, at Augusta, Ga., on May 13, and Jackson, Miss., on May 14.

It is necessary to begin with the events in Augusta, rather than Kent, because the events there expose the total falsehood of those United States to the peaceful, responsible that had been going on down "death of a whole decade. The sudden turrid trip of our neo- fashions Attorney General, John Mitchell, to Mississippi "to investigate" must not, under any circumstances, be permitted to wash off the blood from Nixon's custom- carved Southern strategy.

TORTURE AND MASSACRE IN AUGUSTA

On Saturday, May 3, a black 18-year-old, Charles Osman, was tortured with cigarette burns on his feet, hands and buttocks and beaten to death in a jail cell. When the word got out and the blacks were getting ready to march on the city-county building, the white establishment suddenly filled charges against two black inmates for that murder.

The black demonstrators preceded peacefully enough, until they saw the state flag with its Confederate bars and stars, whereas they took it down and burned it. It is at this point that the coup, under the adjective Captain James G. Beek, moved in for the confrontation that ensued. They fired into the crowd and six unarmed "rioters" by dead. The bodies were likewise shot in the back.

The typical of the "rioters" is one of the dead—Charlie Mack Hughey, a 37-year-old father of four, who had just left his miserable job to help his mother's for dinner. He had just returned home from Fort Lauderdale. His mother, Mrs. Carl Mack Hughey, was bitterly and she spoke: "You know, it seems like he was born just to die."

This is U.S.A. May 1970, as Nixon's Southern strategy, and his "perpetual Cambodian" style of rule, ensnare the bear witness to the new strategy of preventive civil war.

SCLC's Reverend Abernathy has called for a mass march. We will see whether it will be as massive as the demonstrations against Nixon's Cambodian invasion and massacre at Kent, Ohio.

ANTI-WAR MASS DEMONSTRATIONS

Great as was the outpouring of opposition to Nixon's Cambodian invasion at Kent, the 300,000 who marched in Washington, D.C., on May 8 were only part of the throngs who marched throughout the country. The dominant feature that completed even Nixon's double-tongued, deaf, superstitious in the White House to listen was the sequence of events that began at Berkeley or New York, not in Los Angeles or Wisconsin, but in the heretofore static mid-American "belly of the beast, Ohio.

On April 30, just as Nixon finished his bomb- tongued speech about the U.S. imperialist invasion of Cambodia that "was not an invasion," the students took to the streets. ... The second day, President Nixon at the Pentagon, (Continued on page 4).

(End)
THE SINO-SOVIET ORBITS

Now that our imperiled government has committed its greatest blunder by the expansion of the Vietnam-war, we must face both the developing civil war in Cambodia, and its expansion to the Indo-Chinese orbits.

The satellite that China sent into orbit April 24 was the beginning of a new stage of world relations. The two nuclear States, backed by single-word mastery, have become three. In no sense, therefore, can the Chinese feat be dismissed as "still not measuring up" to the two global powers. Whether the two state-capitalist powers calling themselves Communist will act as a unit on the Cambodianfront, or follow separate paths to global conflict, the revolutionary opposition to war must not be tied to any state power. If it is serious about uprooting exploitative class societies.

Truth is context and each conflict must be examined in its field as well as in a world context. In the specific Cambodian war, we need first to look at the new role not only of U.S. imperialism, but also of Prince Sihanouk. Having failed to establish a mass base for himself as a "neutralist" among the Cambodian peasantry who were, above all, concerned about their own poverty and misery, Prince Sihanouk is ready, via China, to collaborate with the "Red Khmers" who, if they should not be able to overthrow the new militaristic regime, can establish guerrilla bases in the countryside.

On an Sihanouk basis, on the conditions that North Vietnam and the Pathet Lao also aid. In any case, Chou Enlai met with these forces to plan the joint strategy. And Mao has issued his "opinions" about World War III.

And now all did not go unnoticed by the most revolutionary governments in Southeast Asia, who responded with calls for a new "anti-Communist" front that must be numerically and counter-revolutionary regime

In Indonesia, led by General Suharto. Thus far, nothing much of it, but U.S. imperialism is looking favorably on its offer. It becomes necessary once again to return to the home front and examine the conflicting forces at work there.

MISSISSIPPI, AND AGNEW'S NEO-FASCIST DEMOCRACY

On May 14, some 25 white racist cops and highway patrolmen in Jackson, Miss., facing a group of black male youths, clustered before a black women's dormitory at a state college, "horsewhipped" and beaten them bloody.

When the students, who were protesting the racism, returned to their quarters, the police beat them with clubs and fists. They turned their guns against the unarmed men. They beat them bloody, killing seven of them there. And James Earl Green, 17, a high school student, lay dead. 15 others were injured.

The racist mayhem is not unconnected with Agnew's "speech" as the "spawning ground and sanctuary of the movement" at the University of Pennsylvania. So great a favorite in the South is Vice-President Agnew because that he was"chosen to be the featured speaker at a Confederealist"institute.

Keith Giba, Augusta, Ga., Jackson, Miss.-12 dead and some 25 hurt— all this has happened in the first two weeks of May, long before the hot summer has started, long before the student youth who will graduate will have to go jobs waiting for them, and long before the labor contract will expire this year of recession.

Whether it is war-mongering National Guardians, or racist cops who beat, bastinado and burn youth to death, the point is: who is issuing these "law and order" edicts to perpetrate these lawless and murderous acts? Who inspired the New York police to loot the other way as some racist construction workers attacked the anti-war youth?

Who, if not the Agnew-Nixon Administration, is manipulating an alleged "bill of rights" to lash out against the youth with no more regrett than we showed over disregarding rotten apples from a barrel? If such Agnewites are considered non-presidential, non-regressive, his "freedom" to nas, then why shouldn't the armed Establishment feel they have the license to do against radical youth that Agnew does call "the criminal Left that belongs, not in a dormitory, but in a penitentiary?"

And what is the purpose other than fascist brainwashing for the studied and persistent attacks on the mass media, especially the TV, as they photograph those super-patriots and reactionaries in their nefarious acts against demonstrators? Who other than Nixon-Agnew-Michelle—those polluted minds and foul mouths—have made "macho" synonymous with warmongering, and suckers of facts synonymous with "an effete corps of impudent smut"?

Where do we go from here? Is it possible to conclude anything else from these gay events than the fact that the President and his alter-ego have, from the moment they got into the White House, been preparing for the undeclared war abroad to be extended into a civil war at home?

LABOR, RECESSIO AND WAR

Now that Nixon has shown that his wars abroad are but extensions of his wars at home, it becomes imperative for the New Left, the anti-war movement, the black liberation movement and women's liberation movement to take a second look at themselves, at their theoretical as well as practical activities, for there are danger signals here too. Not only is there an attempt to divert the anti-war movement into the political field — to vote for "downs"—there are also elitist opponents of labor who play up the fact that some construction workers had best up anti-war youth demonstrators.

There is no doubt that the building workers' racial union, along with some longshoremen under Mafia control, are outright reactionaries who must be fought. Not to portray these as characteristic of the labor movement at this time when strikes on the part of white and black workers—from the postal workers to the transistionals and from the leaders to the welfare workers—are at their most militant, is to fly in the face of the facts, as well as to fall into the old divisive capitalist trap of separating worker from worker, and workers from intellectuals.

Of course, there are some workers who oppose the anti-war demonstrator. So does part of the student body. Of course, there are some sectors of the construction workers, who are reactionaries. So are the "Young Americans for Freedom." Neither facts can possibly take away from the full truth and that is that a whole generation now opposes the imperialist war games, the capitalist planned recessions and the racist fabric of American life.

More characteristic of the present stage of intensifying strike and anti-war struggles are the two Los Angeles Teamster locals—both distributed leaflets in opposition to the construction workers and, at the same time, asked the students to help them in their wildcatting against both management and the labor bureaucracy (see p. 2).
At the same time, it is clear that the struggle against the war must deepen to the point where it concerns itself with the struggles against the whole system which produces war—capitalism.

This stage of heightened labor struggles comes at a time when even the administration cannot hide either the fact of rising unemployment, or that the inflation continues despite the planned unemployment. The economic crisis in the country is inseparable from the growing black unrest. These two movements must be joined, rather than kept poles apart from, the anti-war struggles.

STUDENTS MUST LISTEN TO WORKERS

Some of the student Left better ask themselves why it is that, as against the mass demonstrations for the Kent martyrs when no less than 65 campuses were shut down at least in part, only 15 black students, and no whites, gathered at the University of Mississippi campus at Oxford to protest the shootings at a Jackson college. So bewildered are the white students in contrast the fact that black students at Vance College sat down spontaneously to show their solidarity with the Kent students. But, this far, few white college students have sprung up to demonstrate their solidarity with the blacks.

Along with the revolutionary black dimension, what is needed in the expansion and intensification of the anti-war movement is for the youth to begin to listen seriously to listen, to the questions that workers raise. Thus, some of the workers who did not march and that they were definitely opposed to Nixon's war, wanted all GI's out of Southeast Asia, but did not wish to march under a Viet Cong flag (see page 6). They were for self-determination of the Vietnamese people, but did not want to make it appear that they preferred Russia or China to the U.S.A. In a word, they were asking for an independent stand, both against the war and for labor's rights here, against both private capitalism and state-capitalism, which calls itself Communist.

The pragmatism that permeates the "socialist" Left, who consider any unity of anti-war forces to be above all an underlying philosophy of liberation, cannot for long shut out concern for the international ramifications of the latest stage in the Indo-Chinese war as well as, and, above all, for the objective revolutionary forces and their search for a totally new way of life.

Marxist-Humanists know that the class question is at home. But they also know that, just as no country can be seen outside of a world context, so none can be separated from the underlying philosophy which will give the momentous actions of the masses their direction. In a word, the freedom struggles cannot be separated from the philosophy of freedom since only as they are united can the creation of the new be in hand with the overthrow of the old instead of, once again, having the revolution go over the day after the conquest of power.

To fill the theoretic void in the anti-war movement has become a matter of life and death as we fight the repressive forces unleashed by the Nixon Administra-
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BRITISH RACISM, Powellism and the Workers

By Raya Dunayevskaya

(1) In August-September, 1970, the British labour leader Enoch Powell, who, in his famous speech in the early 1960s, had argued that the British government should follow a policy of "rational separation" of the races in Britain, was back on the hustings. His campaign was aimed at attracting the support of working-class people who feel that the British state is failing to protect them from the consequences of the economic crisis.

(2) During his campaign, Powell emphasized that the British government should not only be concerned with economic matters, but also with the cultural and social aspects of race relations. He argued that the British state should take a more active role in promoting cultural diversity and creating opportunities for the different racial groups to live together in harmony.

(3) Powell's campaign was met with a divided response from the working-class community. Some people were impressed by his commitment to addressing the root causes of racial tensions, while others were critical of his more traditional approach to race relations.

(4) In conclusion, it is clear that the British government must take a more proactive role in addressing the complex issues of race relations and cultural diversity. While Powell's campaign may have been divisive, it is clear that there is a need for a more comprehensive approach to tackling these issues in the future.
they moved away from that principle, the establishment of a totally new form of society, the People’s Commune. He then moved away from the skilled workers to the unskilled, from the institutionalized workers to the unorganized, from what Lenin called the “aristocracy of labour” to what Marx called “deeper and deeper into the masses” to find the true revolutionary core who would stand, not just for reforms, but for revolution.

What has happened since the end of the 1890’s when Great Britain embarked on its imperialist adventure in Suez, and Russia (with the help of China) on its destruction of the Hungarian Revolution, is the defilement that always follows long revolutions. Instead of jokes that went down upon the “immigrants”, the British, the Americans, and the East Europeans, ought to hail the birth of the new Third World, especially the African Revo-

The struggle for the minds of men is still the mightiest weapon of all. And now that the French proletariat and the French students have shown that the defence of freedom has not been destroyed in technologically advanced lands, it is all the more quinquen-

tal that the British proletariat rise to its full height and, as their ancestors showed the way to the First Working Men’s International, so they should now give a new road of world solidarity between themselves and all the “immigrants” of the world. The first step in that direction is the recognition of the fact that many of them have been repeating the reactionary ideas of their own exploiters.

Comradely yours, 

Raya.
Philosophy, 'life-style' and U.S. workers

run away from any control by workers because the labor bureaucracy is in one with management in signing away any control over the production line to management.

In a word, the way in which the workers interpret "bread and butter", the way in which the labor bureaucracy interprets it—and, unfortunately, the way in which also the militant youth interprets it—are miles apart. It is this unbridgeable gulf (unbridgeable because different classes are involved, from opposite sides of the production line) that is the mark of today's "revolutionaries," who seem to think that activism, whether it is at a peak, or at the point of production is one and the same thing, and that it happens more obviously at the peak than at the point of production, that makes the workers "backward." Note, please, that I didn't go into the details that you, yourself, admit that many of the workers are also anti-war but I will now go into the anti-war activities of the youth.

**There is no doubt that this is the greatest event of this decade; that it has created a whole generation of revolutionaries and that, therefore, it has the potentiality of leading to a pre-revolutionary situation. But (1) that anti-Vietnam war movement did not, did not arise out of "sex, dope, rock music and communal living." It arose, first and foremost, in response to the objective situation, the imperialist U.S. bombing of Hanoi. (2) It stems from the youth who have experienced contact with the black revolution, from whom it learned, not only its tactics but also its black bravery. The concrete path led from the freedom rides through FSM (both as an affinity to the black revolution and as an affinity to the Marxist concept of alienation) to the Ann Arbor teach-in. In a word, the awakening of the youth, as a revolutionary force, was the new, much denigrated Civil Rights Movement. Of course, the recognition that the system will not be changed via Civil Rights tactics but through revolution is a great leap forward if revolution is understood historically, actually, philosophically, as a social revolution which, moreover, does not stop at the political phase, or on the day of revolution, but wants to make sure that the day after we are not confronted with a new Stalin hierarchy but continue on un-terrifically to totally new human relations which the masses themselves establish and re-establish every day and check on daily.

I do not mean to designate the workers. They certainly live a superior phenomenon, the statement. They certainly respect that the existing society. Do see to say: the workers that in a class-conscious society there are two worlds; in every country in every generation, a youth, a culture-conscious, a society, worlds within the existing structure that understand. That is the proof of the dialectic, that every youth is the opposite within itself, and that the growing, the forces of the new, the contradictions, as well as is in a class sense, are lined up for the anti-death struggle long before they are "armed." But that makes the one who are "armed" the revolutionaries. Even though their chaotic acts lead to the brutal breakup of themselves, and even though it gives the Nixon Agnew terrorists the excuse to conduct their counter-civil war before the objective situation and the objective forces have ceased to assure, the forces of the social revolution.

This type of activism is not revolutionary, very serious and "the alternative strategy" (I am using the word "serious," not in the theoretical sense, but in the Hegelian sense of "laborious, serious, and suffering of the masses") activist putting one's life on the line, is most serious. It means a revolutionary uprooting of the social capitalistic (I'm sure you realize that I am indicating the social capitalist and not merely a violent uprooting of a 1000!) bringing the masses must be as a social union, the pure of a whole human being as the new society for the truly human and wholly free. 4 and 10 because, on the other hand, are as alienated, fragmented and oppressive of the old society as the pure society, the social classes produce outside the social revolution.

As against the worker, Miller, Puig and the man which Maipes, "Cultural Revolution" has produced over and over, and which, finally, the "Cultural Revolution" of Franklin and Selva-Peraza has produced vis-a-vis and collectively, all development has come.
occurred through history, that is to say through social class, generational and cultural struggles that have been carried on by the powerless people of the world. It is enough to wish to engage in a battle of ideas.

Your description of events have made me see even more clearly than before how very urgent is this need for the unity of theory and practice. When someone as brave and wonderful as your friend comes to have been ends up dead as young as 20, I am amazed, not only against this degenerate police-state of state, but also against the delusions that make a youth think that the individual acts would bring about a revolution. Must the youth sacrifice their bodies to prove the, repugnance of this capitalist society? Can't we go beyond socialist as well as a social revolution? Can't we see that thinking too, is an activity, that this think activity is only "shouting". Irrespective of the underlying philosophy, is not only as one-sided as the ivory tower type of thinking, but is precisely what the Establishment, the power structure on both sides of the Atlantic and Pacific and the China and Red Sea and Indian Ocean— are counting on we doing? We, therefore, prove only one thing. We are so organized as part of this society we were supposed to be uprooting as the society itself is. Because we are operating within its pragmatic, philosophic structure.

This note has been不够 long already but I do want to say one word, at least, about "living in communities." No doubt the youth think that this is very new, very revolutionary and shows that they are living in a different world, a totally different world from that of the Establishment. Unfortunately, it's also a very different world, and not necessarily for the better, from where the masses live and must live. It is a way of isolating oneself, not only from the workers who are the main revolutionary force but from the population as a whole. And it is, again, a capitalist's device. But it is to break the various revolutionary forces from ever finding each other.

Do you remember that秩序 was the only one who knew what Lenin did not know, that he need not fear the Second International's opposition to the first world holocaust he was going to unleash because the socialists [] were so isolated, lived so much by themselves, had their own rituals for everything from marriage as "against" the bourgeoisie, to naming of their children by revolutionary instead of biblical names, that they had no contact with the unregarded "backward" masses and this isolation assured capitalism? But that the masses, were "spontaneously" enter into that moment, and it is precisely at that moment that the socialists—had they been isolated and therefore compelled to experience the division within their own ranks before the outburst of war—could have played a revolutionary role. As it is, the flight of the revolutionaries to transform the imperialist war into a civil war came only after the Russian Revolution succeeded.

SO-CALLED COMMUNAL living is not new in America and is the very opposite of the Paris commune "storming the barricades." The only ones in this country who attempted this, for a brave 72 hours, were the workers in St. Louis. Against that type of inspiration, the American intellectuals were trying to show them that association with the blacks is the only "transcendental" gesture that needs the challenge of the times. Whether or not you would like to look into that period with Abolitionists' eyes, or only with eyes of today and at "order", I would very much like to see a review by you of Hawthorne's "Millvina Rozencizee Retribution."

No, I do not think that we're in an immediately pre-revolutionary situation, least of all resulting from the sex and drug culture, and neither does Nilute. What he does see is that he can take advantage of these epochal actions to prevent any such possibility from developing out of the converging class struggles and the possible transformation of the anti-Vietnamese war movement into a fully revolutionary movement. I am enclosing our Perspectives of this year and I'm looking forward to your comments. A copy of the WL pamphlet was also sent to you, we are expanding and folding it as a printed pamphlet. There is a new revolutionary force, and you, alone, are working to see that it does not isolate itself from the proletariat, from the blacks, towards massive exception.

Yours,
RATAN
July 24, 1979

P.S. I'd like to recommend to you the study of one of the most beautiful works on China, especially the chapter on "The Nirvāṇal Revolt or Mystical Exception." You will then see that "today and in this age" had been anticipated by some 1900 years in the concept of Void. The work is entitled "The Civilization and Revolution" by Etienne Balazs. It happens that when I was in Japan in 1966, I was asked by these modern day existentialists a very "superior" question on the "Oriental Void."

My translator on the platform informed me that it was a malicious question which merely meant to show up both Marxism and Leninism. I insisted, however, on answering it quite seriously, both as it first occurred in history, and why these modern existentialists have no basis for their "shaking up with their concept of "suffering" situations." In any case, I believe it will help return you to historic situations as illustrations of the present.
TWO WORLDS

Marx, Lenin, and their detractors

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom

EDTORS NOTE: We reprint below the foreword article by Harry McShane for the special pamphlet published by the Scottish Marxist-Humanist Group to mark Lenin’s 100th birthday and Marx’s 200th birthday anniversaries this year. The pamphlet contains two articles by Raya Dunayevskaya, “A Plea to the Detractors of Lenin” and “Marx’s Debt to Hegel.”

MARX PLACED man on a higher level than that of being a cog in a soulless machine. Man was seen by Marx as the creator of a new society with all his attributes and faculties directed toward the attainment of freedom and human development. In the first of the two articles (according to when they were written) Raya Dunayevskaya deals with the relationship of Marxist theory to the philosophy of Hegel, but because of the attention which Lenin is receiving just now we reversed the order of the articles. Both articles go a long way to help illumine prevalent in the minds of those who know little or nothing about the extent to which Marxism has been distorted.

No one, nowadays, calls on the workers to jol “the Party of Lenin and Stalin,” but there are many who place the name of Lenin alongside that of Stalin for discernible reasons. They would make Lenin take share of the responsibility for the savage policy pursued by the Russian leaders during the reign of Stalin, and inherited by the bureaucrats now ruling over the Russian people. It should be noted that the Communist Party avoid contrasting Lenin with Stalin while, of course, deploiring the cult of the individual.

Raya Dunayevskaya takes Paul Carden, author of The Meaning of Socialism, as being representative of “the others.” Carden ignores the persistent struggle made by Lenin against bureaucratisation, and Lenin’s own, often bitter, struggle against this part of the world about that struggle. The charge that Lenin was good for bureaucracies is completely demolished by the writer who shows that Lenin, in his struggle with Trotsky, insisted on the workers retaining their own organisations for the purpose of protecting themselves “from their own state.” She quotes from Lenin to prove conclusively that, above all else, he wanted “the workers themselves to draw up, from below, the new principles of economic conditions.” He did not want the state to be the state he founded going in a direction opposite to what he desired. Russia has lessons for every man and woman who is really concerned about the future of society.

No less was placed on the alertness and vigilance of the standards hurled at Lenin from 1917 onwards. Apart from a number of heretical reactionaries, no serious-minded person now questions his integrity or his devotion to the cause of human emancipation. In the field of political theory his writings reveal him as a giant compared to the political leaders, on both sides of the Atlantic, whose careers are dependent on their efforts to introduce the appearance of stability into an unstable social order. In his book, Marxism and Freedom, the author refers to Lenin having turned to a study of Hegel during the First World War—a point that has relevance to the subject of the second article which deals with the hearing of Hegel’s philosophy on Marxism.

THIS ARTICLE will not be welcomed by those “Marxists” who refuse to look beyond the Party directive for political wisdom. It may be seized by those who, having seen Marxism distorted to justify acts of oppression, turned away in disgust. Those who take the trouble to read it will attach greater importance to Marx’s than heirloom, and they will find that the emphasis placed on the philosophical foundations of Marxism gives it a new meaning for all prepared to play a part in the struggle for freedom.

Raya Dunayevskaya, bringing scholarship to the subject, places emphasis on the dialectic and its relevance to world events. She takes account of events from the East German rising of 1953, right down to the Vietnam war. She does not, and cannot separate theory from practice.

Getting to the heart of her subject she declares that Aliensness was central to the Hegelian philosophy, and was also central for Marx. Readers will be impressed by her description of how Marx, when taking up what was central in Hegel, applied it in the real world of ordinary human beings living in a particular social order. She denies, however, that Hegel was completely divorced from the real world and claims that on the contrary, he had “his finger on the pulse of history.” She makes the point that Lenin found the revolutionary spirit of the dialectic in the works of Hegel.

ON READING this article one wonders how some of us could dismiss Hegel without knowing much about him. We were content to learn that Marx turned Hegel upside down and to leave it at that. No thought was given to Marx having accepted Alienism and finding his route in capitalist production. That is, where the worker sells his labor power as a commodity and where he is dominated by the products of past labor taking the form of capital. There, the worker loses his individuality and becomes the most essential element in a system of production which human freedom is impossible. The concept of Alienism is truly revolutionary. With Marx it is a call for the overthrow of the present social order.

It is rapidly becoming obvious to most workers that emancipation does not come automatically with the abolition of private ownership. Conditions have become intolerable where private capitalists have been replaced by a bureaucratic machine. Alienation, which Marx detected under private capitalism, exists also under state capitalism. The masses under both systems are dominated by their products. The hope of the future does not rest with the doling of top politicians, or with technology, but with thinking and acting human beings. These articles justify our placing reliance on the struggle from below.

Harry McShane
Marx, Lenin, and their detractors

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom

EDITORS’ NOTE: We reprint below the Foreword written by Harry McKechnie for the special pamphlet published by the Scottish Marxism-Humanism Group to mark Hegel’s 200th and Lenin’s 100th birthdays this year. The pamphlet contains two articles by Raya Dunayevskaya: “A Footnote to the Detractors of Lenin” and “Marx Died to Hegel.”

MARK PLACED man on a higher level than that of being a cog in a mechanism. Man was seen by Marx as the creator of a new society with all his attributes and faculties directed toward the attainment of freedom and human development. In the first of the two articles (according to which they were written) Raya Dunayevskaya deals with the relationship of Marxist theory to the philosophy of Hegel, but because of the attention which Lenin is receiving just now we reserve the order of the articles. Both articles go a long way to kill illusions prevalent in the minds of those who know little of anything about the extent to which Marxism has been distorted.

No one, nowadays, calls on the workers to join the “Party of Lenin and Stalin.” But there are many who place the name of Lenin alongside that of Stalin for discreditable reasons. They would make Lenin take share of the responsibility for the savage policy pursued by the Stalinist leaders during the reign of Stalin, and inherited by the bureaucratic now ruling over the Russian people. It should be noted that the Communist Party avoids contradicting Lenin with Stalin while, of course, denying the guilt of the individual.

Raya Dunayevskaya takes Paul Carden, author of the “Marxism and Socialism,” as being representative of the detractors of Lenin. Like others, Carden ignores the persistent struggle made by Lenin against bureaucratic cradle and control. Fortunately, little is known in this regard. The struggle was long and arduous. The charge that Lenin stood idly by is completely unfounded. The writer, who spent years in prison, is himself a victim of that charge. His unswerving devotion to the cause of liberty is not, according to him, derivative from sublimation, but his own consciousness of the necessity of a new order of society. He quotes themselves “from their own state.” She quotes from Lenin to prove conclusively that, above all else, he wanted “the working-class to draw, from below, the new principles of economic conditions.” He did not live to see the state he founded going in a direction opposite to what he desired. Russia is less for every man and woman who is really concerned about the future of society.

No limit was placed on the amount and viciousness of the slander hurled at Lenin from 1917 onwards. Apart from a number of inconsiderable reactions, no serious-minded person now questions his integrity or his devotion to the cause of human emancipation. In the field of political theory his writings reveal him as a great leader, on both sides of the Atlantic, whose views are dependent on their efforts to introduce the appearance of stability into an unstable social order. In his book, Marxism and Freedom, the author refers to Lenin having turned to a study of Hegel during the first World War—a point that has relevance to the subject of the second article which deals with the bearing of Hegel’s philosophy on Marxism.

THIS ARTICLE will not be welcomed by those “Marxists” who refuse to look beyond the Party directives for political wisdom. It may be sponsored by those who, having seen Marxism distorted to justify acts of oppression, turned away in disgust. Those who take the trouble to read it will attach greater importance to the emphasis placed on the philosophy foundations of Marxism than bitterness, and will find that the Kemans give it a new meaning for all prepared to play a part in the struggle for freedom.

Raya Dunayevskaya, bringing scholarship to the subject, places emphasis on the dialectic and its relevance to world events. She takes account of events from the East German crisis of 1953, right down to the Vietnam war. She does not, and cannot separate theory from practice.

Getting to the heart of her subject she declares that Allmameth was central to the Hegelian philosophy, and she was also central for Marx. Readers will be impressed by her description of how Marx, when taking up what was central in Hegel, applied it to the real world of ordinary human beings living in a particular social order. She says: “No Marx, no Hegel was completely divorced from the reality of the concrete world of human beings living in a particular social order.”

On reading this article one wonders how some of us could dismiss Hegel without knowing much about him. We were content to learn that Marx turned Hegel upside down and to leave it there. No thought was given to Marx having accepted Allemann and finding its roots in capitalist production. That is where the worker sells his labor power as a commodity, and where he is dominated by the products of past labor taking the form of capital.

There the worker loses his individuality and becomes the most essential element in a system of production under which human freedom is impossible. The concept of Allemann is truly revolutionary. With Marx it is a call for the overthrow of the present social order.

It is rapidly becoming obvious to most workers that emancipation does not come automatically with the abolition of private ownership. Conditions have become intolerable where private capitalists have been replaced by a state machine. Alienation, which Marx detected under private capitalism, exists also under state capitalism. The masses under both systems are dominated by their products. The hope of the future does not rest on any change in the class of top politicians, or with technology, but with thinking and acting human beings. These articles justify our placing reliance on the struggle from below.

—Harry McKechnie.
The revolutionary traditions in France are so long and many that each succeeding social revolution as well as every philosophic revolution following the great French Revolution were, throughout Europe, provided with the foundation laid in France. Because every great step forward in philosophic speculation flows from the discovery of a new way to make the plunge to freedom in actuality, the philosophic revolutions in Germany were directly related to the historical developments in France.

Thus, the Stuplin dialectic developed under the impact of the French Revolution. Or, more precisely put, it was the dialectic of the setting of new reshaping history that was transformed into philosophic method by the genius of G.W.F. Hegel.

Thus, the Marxian dialectic developed out of the creativity of the French masses in the 1848 revolution, and reached a new historic dimension as the Paris Commune in 1871 "stormed the heavens." To complete the French edition of his greatest theoretical work, Capital, in 1872-1873, Marx urged all to read it because "it possesses a scientific value independent of its origin and should be considered even by readers familiar with the German language."

But theoretical foundations for November, 1817, "corrode" Marx's Civil War In France as well as revolution. Indeed, the better way could there have been to express his new universal, "a new political philosophy: that which is not merely outside, but into which the police, society, no affiliations. Every worker, every peasant, every laborer, every one who is exploited, the whole population is a man!"

THE, EVEN WHEN REVOLUTIONARY events are not carried to a definitive conclusion, as was true in 1848, the socialist revolution showed anew the power of the self-activity of the masses who, at one and the same time, understood and lived the thought of the new. To hold that such things could not happen in a technologically advanced country. This revolution in industrialized France put an end to the self-serving myth of "technological rationality" which had turned the proletariat into one-dimensional creatures whose flesh and bones became "nothing," as Marx put it, the "rupture of the capitalist system."

This revolution that had not come to full fruition had created a new form of relationship between working and non-working people, as well as Action Committees. Nor did these people fulfill the barricades for the communists and the deputies. The situation of the revolutionary situation has any illusions as to where power resides, among the million workers deemed tools and look to the streets. In all, involving 10 million in a general strike.

The Spring weakening in workers' self-activity created waves of keeping the Communist Party and its COT at bay. The workers' occupation of the factories upset the bureaucrats' calculations and negotiations with the State on capitalist grounds. They cooperated with the students in creating new international relations as the movement in France brooked through all bounds.

NO ONE IN FRANCE in May, 1898, needs to be told about the counter-revolutionary work of the Communist Party which helped stiffe the revolution. What does need new is the continued and independent revolutionaries. Although they wished to go all the way to the overthrow of capitalism, and expected the workers in all their actions, they nevertheless felt that the unfolding of a new philosophy which would give them a direct way was something they could pick up "sometime." Being, thus, theoretically equipped to win the minds away from the utopia of Communism's antiquity, clothed in Marxist language, they must not now rise to the challenge of the time and develop a theory based on the movement from practice and capable of cutting with both sticks, by itself, remains one-sided and, therefore, irrevocable of fruition.

On the other hand, cycles who claim that Guttland without DeGaulle only "proves" that May, 1898, was "nothing," must explain why there is an inadequacy of reference for anything and everything (and not only in France). May, 1898, not DeGaulle, 1955-1969. This is not to say that there was a social revolution. Nor is it to mean to cover up the unfinished character of revolution action. Rather, it is said in order to stress that new beginnings always start from the highest development of the last revolutionary situation. And not only on native grounds.

SPRING, 1958 WITNESSED explosion, not only in France, but also in Czechoslovakia. On the surface, it may have appeared that by Spring, 1958, "democratization" in Czechoslovakia could not compare with the near-revolution in France, and it could certainly wasn't as startling as the new culture in a Western land. But the tendencies of some Western European revolutions to look only at the surface appearance as if it could be forever part of the revolution. The mass in motion, the free flow of ideas, the philosophers searching for new ways of approach, and relations with workers, only proved that the gulf which divides East from West exists not only among the ruling classes but also among the workers. The truth is that not only did the workers and student youth far beyond the frontier, but also the Communist Party itself, gradually grown and produced new tendencies. On the one side, were massed the "Party's" 500,000 students-budding soldiers (each member more than the imperialist USA had in South Vietnam). On the other side, on that lethal August 20th when Khrushchev tanks invaded Czechoslovakia, stood the unarmed Czech people resisting to a man, the armed invaders. All this culminated with a more expression of international solidarity, (The French CP pretended that much, as what they demanded of us is the same, international solidarity is not something we do for the Czechoslovak masses. Rather, it is a way of learning something vital from them. As I wrote at the time)." A paper is making Czechoslovakia as an hottest periodic capitalism—the specters of Mardovi Communist. It is a picture that reveals the contradictions in capitalism within a country and the borders between countries. It is a picture which reveals the trends that separate the generations and keep workers and intelligentsia apart (perpetuated as something in the flesh, something in the blood, or metaphysical), but also the stuff of which revolutions are made and remake, the underlying cause of spontaneous organization and organization as a single force cannot be separated from each other as a forward movement of the masses."

January 1991
rediscovery of Marx's humanism in 1968, that they had
re-discovered that authentic core of Marxism lying in
the immediate post-World War II world: this only proves
that workers' and intellectuals' historical experience in
different worlds in every country, in the mid-1940s, the
theorists of the dictatorship of the proletariat, communists,
and capitalists as well as to who the
goals of the humanism of Marxism was discussed as an intellec-
tual level only. None of them thought Communists as
the State Capital in it represents. No one questioned
its role in World War II, either during the Hoxha-Stalin
Part or after, much less raised the question of any
inclusion in the nuclear power that American
imperialism raised in Japan.

History will never blame American imperialism for this wanton, inhuman, nuclear holocaust. Neither will it forget the destruction of international Com-

munism as the bombs fell on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

August 9th and August 9th, 1945. Listen to what roles
call itself Libermans, on August 9, the day between the
atomic explosions:

"The atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima seems to
have caused considerable destruction. American reports
suggest nothing less than the disappearance from the
face of the earth of a town of 300,000 inhabitants.
The effects of the discovery are considerable. Nevertheless,
the Vatican has been pleased to dangerous of its May 8th
be permitted to express its surprise, however when
the Stasi had the privilege of picking total war with a
moment made the Holy See was not easily convinced."

The Hoxha Communist paper, L'Allia on August
10, 1945:

"The news that an atomic bomb was dropped by the
American Air Force has made an enormous impression
throughout the whole world and has been received on all
sides with a sense of panic and void of condemnation.

This news, it seems to us, a curious psychological pheno-
menon and a dangerous obedience to a form of abstract
humanism, which, in the sense of 1918, which has been expressed in certain press con-
munications of the Allies, is not a real concrete use which
was made of the fearful engine of destruction."

And, finally, The Daily were the true Britains on
August 14, the day before Japan surrendered uncondi-
tionally:

"There was no official list of the length of time the
atomic bomb was dropped by the American Air
Force including the atom bomb—It seemed to
make a noise like a loud sound."

EVER SINCE THE DEATH of Stalin, followed, first, by
the wave of The Russian Communist Congress on June 17, 1953
and within a few weeks, by a spring in the USSR
throughout the country, the move-
ment from practice has been the challenge the move-
cent of the world. In Europe, the Sino-Soviet conflict reached
its peak in 1956, workers practiced Marxism-Leninism by
the Leaders of the Workers' Councils, by defending freedom from
Communism by trying to establish workers' power on
new human foundations, where
freedom of work and the basis of the power of all.

It was shortly after the Russian attacks, with Mao's
everything in Asia, that caused the
rebirth of Marxism-Leninism and
1949, against the best American intellectuals
and revolutionaries of the world. I had seen that American workers, in their battles against exploitation, first by a general strike in the streets of New York,
with wildcats throughout the auto industry
had raised the most profound philosophical problems
"when they asked: What kind of labor should man do?
Why is there such a gut between thinking and doing?"
Chapter XVI, "Hegemony and the New Human-
ism."

The first edition of Marxism and Freedom (pub-
lished in the United States and Latin America) age of revolutions—industrial, political, social, and
socio-cultural—that included the European age, with
two new pages for freedom, the one in East
Europe against Communism and the one in the
United States against racism. I was critical for placing
the Montgomery, Alabama, Bay of Pigs of 1955-1956, in
the same year as the Hungarian Revolution of 1956.
With the birth
of a new Third World, initiated by the African Revolu-
tions, the color black, became a new force of revolution.
Globally, it is, too, has now reached an impasse
must one choose between existing world state powers
before one can achieve full freedom? For a while, he
looked as if Mao's China was proving to be an independent
third world, different from the countries for world power
—U.S. imperialism and Russian State Capitalism, rid-
ing itself Communism. But as the Vietnam War has
proved all over again, the single-export colonial subordi-
nates freedom struggles to its respective power struggles.

IN PROVIDING AS EMPTY a shelter for mind, as
the fall-out shelter is for the body, Communist State
Capitalism is giving full proof of the scholarly Marx
does not predicted for the decomposition of the capital-
istic system. This has never been true in history since 1950's when
Mao's China, at one and the same time, joined the exclusive nuclear club and enforced its new
negotiation with the Axis of the-human, an inevitable around the
European socialist revolutions: a new
revolutionary opposition within China opposed to the
re-establishment of the new totalitarianism has arisen.
Calling themselves the Shang-wen-wen of Burma (Humphreys,
Provisional People's Revolutionary Group, Provisional People's Revolutionary Group). The
Chinese, there is what it wrote in its Manifesto. Which Chinese.

"Intensified by his victory of February-March, Chou
En-lai presented the general revolutionaries of China.
Red Capitalist class—hastened to set up revolu-
tionary committees in all parts of the country. If the
bourgeois pie had been polluted, the proletariat
would have repeated his game. The form of
political power is superficially changed. The old provincial party committees and old military district commis-
sion by "the revolutionary committee" or "provisionary group
for revolutionary committees." However, old lines continue to play the leading role in the "new political
power..." and the mass line and so on as such talks.

"Victory of the Chinese proletariat and the broad
masses of revolutionary people and the extinction of the
bourgeoisie, which are the present focus. The
world-shaking great festival of the revolutionary
people...the revolutionary groups...the revolutionary
movement...the People's Communist China... will
never cease!"

This, too, was published in that remarkable year,

Thus, as we see, new revolutionary forces have
arisen everywhere to blow away the germs that
capitalism and freedom are made for the purpose of establishing
a party machine; party-consolidation is there to throttle
the revolution, not to release the energy and
the enthusiasm. Marxist is either a theory of
liberation or is nothing. It is nothing to talk in it, in it.
It is the basis for achieving a new human dimension without
which no new society has any value.

IN OUR AGE OF ABOLITES when revolution and
counter-revolution are so interlocked, it is not only
intellectual "in general" who must learn his enemy
in the world, but also the moral revolutionaries. The struggle for
rebellion is the need of a vanguard party "to lead" has
condemned him to the fact in which the desire of
is not on everyone is ready to lead; nobody to
listen to them. Yet the movement from prac-
tice during the past two decades has been characterized by
movement from practice that has been at a fast, stabili-
ized.

To rise to the challenges of the times requires al-
gether new heroes. Marx was the first to equate
the breadth and depth—as both a broad-minded dignity
the collaboration of the philosopher, by which he had put,
the human being in the realm of all human thoughts, he
could unite theory and practice, idealism and mate-
rail, and, without, the group of the
armed bourgeoisie. When asked why he, the bourgeoise
intellectual had broken with his case he became a
"radical," he replied that "to be a radical means to
grasp something at its root. And the root of mankind,
the highest being for man, is man himself." It still is.

The second edition of Marxism and Freedom, pub-
lished simultaneously in the United States and Japan in 1968 included a new chapter, "The Challenge of Mao Zedong" which traced the development of "the 1949 Thought" from 1927 to the Sino-Soviet conflict in the
early 1969's. For the special French edition, I am add-
ing an Appendix on Mao's "Cultural Revolution" as
wished to dedicate this edition to the French
workers and students, who made France, 1968 happened
thereby heralding the coming rebirth of a social revolu-
tion that would not separate itself from Marx's whole
philosophy of liberation, thus making freedom a reality.

--Raya Dunayevskaya
Detroit, Michigan
February, 1969.
Polish uprising, protests against Russian anti-Semitism, reveal state-capitalist crises

By Raya Dunayevskaya, Chairman, National Editorial Board

The spontaneous upsurge of Polish workers' resistance to the unconditional pre-Christmas and New Year increase of 20 per cent price rises on food quickly developed new forms of opposition to their Communist overlords. At one and the same time, shipyard workers at Gdańsk refused to work, marched on the Communist Party headquarters, and, while singing the "international" shouted "Gestapo!" "Gestapo!" at the Com¬
munist police firing into the crowd. On the two-mile march from the Lenin Shipyard to the party headquarters, the ranks of the 5,000 workers swelled to thousands of students, the population as a whole joined it. By the time they reached the party offices and began throwing homemade bombs at them, they numbered 20,000 strong. While official statistics claimed that only 5,000 were dead at the uprising spread to other ports, independent reporters said the number was more like 100,000.

The most immediate demonstration was in Szczecin, Poland's biggest port. Tanks were unleashed against the unarmed crowd, and when one young man's young daughter could not get out of the way fast enough, a tank crushed them both. A young soldier shot by the crier.

No wonder the three Russian divisions stationed in Poland kept their barracks. Very likely, the Russian overlords felt assured that the Polish rulers would shoot down their workers, especially when the uprising spread through the land, including Warsaw itself, where a bust had been hurled at the Soviet Embassy.

"NODDY LISTENS TO YOU"

The week of open and violent revolt succeeded in toppling Gomulka, in a revolution of the fantastic price increase on food, and a few very few, very few wages—plus a great deal of hatred on the part of the "new leaders" about the need to close "the communications gap" between leaders and workers. The daily press is huge. Polish Communist leaders adopt more of the system that capitalism has developed to the market manipulations of "mixed," "state-monopoly" capitalism, while retaining the main working-class movements and the law of value—that is, to say, paying the workers the minimum it takes to reproduce himself and extrude profit from him the maximum unpaid hours of labor it takes to keep expanding production.

Or, as the "new leaders" in Czechoslovakia (now that they are attacking Gomulka) continue Marx's principle correction: to develop production for production's sake and to lose sight of the most important thing in an avalanche of statistics and indices, namely, when and how to raise living standards. Since the 1972 Plan will remain substantially the same, we can be sure that nothing will change from the crucial years of 1972 that we are now tracing. And the essence of the theoretical discussion was that it did allow the exit out of the bag, to wit, that neither Sanatorium, nor the world market, has changed a thing. Labor productivity is the one, the only answer. It is the source of all value. And since that is so, workers in "socialist" lands must work hard and harder.

[Dunayevskaya, January 1971]
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“Otherwise how is it possible to explain why the workers in the United States get more wages than the Polish worker?”

Not a single word was mentioned about the fact that Russia, with any imperialist-collateral land, pays low prices for Poland’s coal and making Poland pay high prices for Russian iron ore. Yet, as a rule, a word was mentioned about the added fact that, from the “ideal” capitalist-industry, Polish industry is an embarrassment that some of it precipitates to the beginning of the century, which means that the worker must be made to accept the harder. And, of course, not a single one of these intellectual historians shared the knowledge that the low labor productivity of the Polish worker, far from being a sign of his backwardness, was, in fact, the exact measure of his revolt against capitalist norms.

Russians continued to plan. The Polish economy went into deeper and deeper crises in 1956. To make matters worse, the war in the East had been very bad, and agriculture took a big dip downwards, so that even bread became scarce in “developed” Poland. Then came Stalin’s imperialist invasion of Czechoslovakia and the mounting anti-communist pressures in the Czech and Slovak Spring and against their own leaders who had sided with Russia.

Obviously, General Moskva considered that a provincial time to challenge “Soviet leadership,” to develop a fullblown aspersion of “Zionism.” But Stalin had already against Zionism. Gomulka recognized that Stalin got some extra grain from Russia, but no help whatsoever from East Germany, the most developed of the satellites. Evidently Ulbricht was too busy, as the stiff-soiled Czechoslovakia radio put it in its August 25 (1956) broadcast:

“We have learned at long last who is responsible for the present economic situation of the whole Czechoslovak economy. . . . International Zionism (a euphemism for the Jews). Apparently even our nearest German neighbors have not experienced this on this subject ever since World War II. . . . Apparently 20,000 people are involved.” Why can’t they then be 20,000,000, if the Soviet command, or perhaps the whole Germany wishes to find them? Apparently, the Polish radio is only too ready to see the only real expert able to distinguish with absolute accuracy between Aryans and inferior races.

Gomulka, who weathered that storm, was toppled when, in economic terms, the five-year Five-Year Plan was seemed to be a failure—this was due mainly to the new socialist plan. The “new” leaders talk differently. At the time General Moskwa has been raised to Politburo membership to assure the knots being made with the “Socialist Countries,” with State Plans. And, in the trip to Moscow on Jan. 3, 1957, showed that the Polish-French Five-Year Plan for the same years,

RUSSIA’S GLOBAL APPETITES

Until the last two weeks of the year, 1959, had seemed to be a very good year for Russia. By the end of 1959 it had moved from border skirmishes with China that and the aspect was seen as short of war to an understanding of terms with China. The exchange of ambassadors, some rise in trade and lowering off time on the side of the war was clearly. It was especially true to pursue its goal alone in the midst of the East, yet, in Europe, because its chief rival for world mastery—U.S. imperialism—was in deepest crisis, both internally and externally. Now, the adventurist invasion of Czechoslovakia and shooting at Kedal, C. and Jackman, had unified the youth opposition and the blacks against him, while the economic recession had brought about a new militancy on the part of labor, that it seemed an encouraging sign.

Time for Russia to extend itself.

Having already established more than a foothold in the Middle East, it now took new initiatives in Europe, by seeking its East German satellites to accept the Moscow- Bonn “non-aggression pact” and trade treaty. It was ever making talk about a general European Security Pact. Whether it would or would not pursue new divisions within NATO, it was certainly true that the new re-ign周转 with West Germany at least worried some who had seen Do Goulit’s attempt at a new Franco-German axis become a reality. In the Middle East Russia felt to certain of its new power that it concluded a military agreement with Egypt that is practically unprecedented.

Now Russia doubled its global status or nuclear power. No matter where the Sino-Soviet conflict would lead in the world, it was indeed divided into two, and only two, big superpowers. Internationally, it is true, Russia had troubles with its neighbors and was still very far from getting its ruthless pretensions to “work hard and harder so as to catch up with and surpass the United States.”

Even here, however, being the totalitarian power it is, it thought it had just the right scoop at the right time to throw terror into the hearts of all dissidents. The “Leningrad affair”—i.e., mainly Jews, who were alleged to have plotted a hijacking—was ending not only with stiff sentences, but two of the Jews—Mark P. Dimotik, 43, and Edward S. Ratnerov, 25—were sentenced to death. Moreover, the Russians evidently thought all this would “sound” good over the air waves to Arab leaders, and thus strengthen Russia’s hand.

Instead, everything came crashing about them. Not only was there a world outcry against the barbarity of the regime, not only did “the West” draw a parallel between the trial of Dussak at Paris in Soviet Spain and the trial of Jews in Communist Russia, but even the Communist Parties of France, Italy, Great Britain and Spain asked them to reverse the verdict. It was clear that, to all, “Zionism” and “dissident” seemed euphemisms for Soviet anti-Semitism.

Nor, finally, was this an outcry only from the “outside.” As an anonymous correspondent of The Times (Feb. 13-19) put it: “Most non-Jewish Soviet citizens are not at all inclined to put up with any semblance of anti-Semitism even in covert form.”

And while its cloy head was revealed in Moscow, the uprising in Poland showed that each country has indeed two worlds and that better protect its class when not going all into a program against the remnants of Tsarist days. At the same time, it cannot forget the Sino-Soviet conflict. Within China, and in the arid, arid Uzbekistan in its “anti-Chinese” campaign, a battle in the Middle East—jel a different time in East Europe. After all, it needs only call Russia “the new year,” and far-away China gives an immediate following in East Europe. Russia is not unaware that the West has ever since its invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1960, “Maneu” has not been confined to Asia.

Thus it came about that the totalitarian country that never listens to world opinion bowed to it, reversed the death sentence to 15 years at hard labor.

This may mean, as many Jews insist, merely a slow instead of immediate death, but it is a change in line, and does give all a breathing space in which to plan for defense against the attack still to come not only against Jews but against all dissidents—workers, youth, intellectuals, and other national minorities—in Russia and in East Europe. The city head as well as the city feet of the Russian bear has been revealed in 1957.

(2) See my analysis of anti-Semitism and state-capitalism in NEWS & LETTERS (February, 1959).
(3) The full translation of the full statement of the discussion on Varga’s Change in the Capitalism Economy as a Result of World War II was published by the Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C.
Two Worlds

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom

Editor's Note: We print below excerpts from Part III of the Perspectives Speech delivered in the Convention of Marx & Engels of the Committee by Raya Dunayevskaya. Copies of the complete report can be ordered from News & Letters for 25c.

Theories abound in the world. Theories about the world, and theories of the world. They are not exclusively held by ideologists, and they are not always manifestly visible, not only to the anti-Communist front, but also in more organic ways to reshape the world that they did not make and which is not our role to do.

If theory were a mere question of reading books or being world travelers, then theories about the world, and theories of the world, are not the slightest exception, or even feeling for what Marx meant by "history and its process" or life politics, not books, led to the dialectic working out of a philosophy of revolution.

Take a simple question as the Machine. That is where Herbert Marcuse's departure from Marxism begins. It is also where our modern age began, and so old Marxism. Marx wrote a magnificent analysis of the Machine in Grundrisse: using a distinct method as well as a revolutionary, the subject of machinery was never dealt with apart from the opposition, the laborer. But, as worked out in this first draft, the concentration was on the logic of technology's development from a complex tool to a full automation, at which point the worker might stand outside of the production process.

This is not the place to go into the whole of the Grundrisse. Here we must limit ourselves only to what Herbert Marcuse says about being "outside of" production process. Not only does it not mean anything that Herbert Marcuse'sses himself as to what, but what is at stake is that Marcuse expects to publish it in 1957, and not because it was "wrong." It was not concrete enough. The changes he introduced reveal the dialectic method in full.

What is theory? 'History and its process.'

Marx states that if one studied the history of inventions, one would be able to see how inexorable from it is the result of the workers. The worker resists the mindless subservience for every move of his hand—the machine. To counter the workers' resistance to the new forms of exploitation, the capitalist, or rather his scientists, keeps inventing every new way of getting rid of the laborers' "inertial hand." This strife between worker and machine, worker and capital, Marx called "history and its process." The key word is process. That is to say, the concrete process of this strife discloses what the workers are doing, the numerous ways they are fighting capitalism at the point of production, and the questions they are posing on every facet from the length of the working day to the kind of labor men should do, the relationship of labor to life.

When Marx told the story of Machinery in capital in 1857, as against 1858, narrative and reason became one, and as historical materialist he launched into an attack not only on capitalists but on those he called "abstract materialists," the scientists, before whom our age bow down, and not only for not "knowing" the economic laws of capitalism, but for having missed entirely "history and its process."

HERBERT MARCUSE

Over 100 years have passed. The automation Marx predicted has come to life. The new word is Automation. It is overpowering. The workers react one way—general strikes, wildcats, revolts. The scientists, the labor unions as well as welfare workers help the workers in the first round. The academic Marxist, the one who in 1911 could write Marxism and Revolution, by 1959 is overcome by the new technology, because he is so rooted in the modern proletariat, that he decides that the proper characterization of our age's one-dimensional society and so he names his worker, the One-Dimensional Man.

One-Dimensional Man does succeed in proving one thing—the one-dimensionality of Herbert Marcuse's thought. He moved, necessarily, from departing from Marx's analysis of machinery, to thrusting outward, nothing short of Marx's concept of revolution, itself: the Marxist concept of revolution (that primarily, if not perhaps, finally, led by the masses) is no longer a mere concept in the mind of man.
and its Process," i.e., the class struggles, hardly helps one grasp reality . . . .

Even if they do not listen to the voices from below, the movement of opposition to Mao in China itself, shouldn't theoreticians at least know how to listen to the theory of the Cultural Revolution? . . .

"The truth is that despite the revolutionary-sounding rhetoric of uninterupted resolution, reintegration has come from its every pore, military "protracted war," regarding the proletariat, "glorious production teams," regarding thought, though guided by the Thought of "the line," the helmsmen of State, "Mao Zedong," the ideological warfare will not be won soon:

"Decades won't do it. A century or several centuries are needed."

. . .

We have talked so long on Herbert Marcuse and Jean-Paul Sartre, not because they merit it, but because, as philosophers experienced in manipulating the dialectic (not Marx's and not even their own but Mao's or whatever is the latest creed), they do carry a thought through to the end. Thereby they cast an illumination on all petty-bourgeois revolutionary thinking. Acknowledged or otherwise, it is there where much of the New Left is entrapped . . .
TWO WORLDS
by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom

1971 is the eleventh year since the Sino-Soviet conflict first broke into the open. By the time, in August, 1969, that Mao launched the so-called Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, not only had Mao succeeded in designating Russia as capitalist, state-capitalist, but all his opponents within China (all, that is, except the actual capitalists who continue to collect their five per cent interest on capital that they manage for the state) as "capitalist readers." There are young revolutionaries who are so enthusiastic about May's exposure of "Khurshidov's phony Commism" (now called "Khrushchev without Khrushchev") as capitalists that they help cover up the greater truths, that (1) long before Khrushchev's "phony Communism" (officialized gospel), it was Stalin who turned it over to Russia and initiated the transformation of the first workers' state into its opposite, a state-capitalist society; (2) it was Mao himself who, in 1966, helped Khrushchev to crush the Hungarian Revolution with its Workers' Councils and struggles for a truly new social order; and (3), furthermore, that Stalin in Russia has had the Russian name for a world phenomenon. Its appearance has nothing whatever to do with the Sino-Soviet conflict (which it anticipated by three long decades), and everything to do with the Great Depression, and fear of imperialism. Therein lies its crucial importance for our day.

THE STAKES
The real question is: What, in this period of recessions that have come to take the place of the Great Depression nevertheless, makes the global crisis so total that even Mao's China is beginning to stretch out a hand toward a little "peaceful co-existence" with the U.S.? What is being constituted not as the hand of a plug ply player (China's own brand of phony "people-to-people relation"), but that of China itself at the very top of the "new" Mao leadership.

Is it that just as the recently concluded 24th Congress of the Russian Communist Party had all its pluses-to-the-sexy promises rest on "greater labor productivity," so Mao's Communism, portrayed of "capitalist readers," continues to lash out against "the black" kind of economism? Or is it this, just this, which makes both... "socialist lands" bear such striking resemblances to that super-imperialist titan, the U.S.A.

State-capitalism, not as a mere word moved out against dictators, but as serious theory, does indeed reflect reality seen in twain by the decisive relations of men at the point of production, those exploitative relations of capital-labor which determine all else in society, especially its thought. Which is why the proletariat, too, in its struggles, fights under totally new, philosophic banners of liberation, as the 1968 Human Manifesto within China itself proved once again. "The form of political power is superficially changed... However, old bureaucratic tends to play the leading role in the new political power... China itself (is) present the general representative of China's Red Capitalist class... as the masses have said, 'everything remains the same after so much ado.' Victory of the Chinese proletariat and the broad masses of revolutionary people and the extinction of the new bureaucratic bourgeoisie is likewise inevitable... the People's Commune of China will surely survive." (1)

In this, the 30th year of the elaboration of the theory of state-capitalism, and the 150th year of the first of the Communist Manifesto, produced by the mass movements in East Europe in the 1960's, growing throughout the world in the 1970's, we must go back to theoretical origins not only to see the historical record straight, but also to test the dialectic method of the great political theory against the dialectics of liberation today.

(Continued on Page 7)

'Culture,' Science and State-Capitalism

THE THEORY OF STATE-CAPITALISM

Born under the impact of the Middle Ages, the Hitler-Stalin Pact; the Cold War; World War II; and Trotsky's calling for the defense of Russia's workers' state, though deprecated, the "state-capitalist" tendency decided to make its own study of the capitalist nature of the Russian society in strict relationship with its Marxian and the specific form of workers' resistance to the Five Year Plan. I happened to have been the first to make a study of the Plans from original Russian sources, but it was not embarked upon solely as a Russian study. It was done as a pretext for Marx's for our age. It was by no accident, therefore, that, in the process of analyzing the operation of the law of value, that makes state-capitalism; that I rediscovered in the early 1940's, Marx's now celebrated 1864 Bourgeois-Philosophy Manuscript. It was his concept of the labor as the measure of history vs. alienated labor which is the mark of capital that governed the study of the Nature of the Russian Economy. (2)

Because the law of value dominates not only on the home front of class exploitation, but also in the world market where its capital of the most technologically advanced land rules, the theory of state-capitalism was not confined to the Russian question; as was the case when the omnipotence was used by others. Unlike the contrary, the new in the theory of state-capitalism, (3)
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Ita dialectic, its conclusions, demonstrated, first, that the State Plan, the State Party, the omnipotent State, removed in an fundamental degree from the capitalist sphere analysis. In Capital, where he showed that it was not the anarchy of the market, but the "depressing plan of capital," which labor confronted daily in the factory. Moreover fundamental was the second point in which the 1930's made it possible to prove, in the context: what Marx could only state in theory about the ultimate development of the concentration and centralization of capital "in the hands of a single capitalist or a single capitalist corporation." (3)

State intervention in the economy, whether totally or in part, characterized both Hitler's Germany and Roosevelt's U.S. "New Deal." Japan's "Co-Prosperity Sphere" as well as the "Labor Government" in Great Britain. What the 1930's established is that under no conditions could the Plan be considered either "socialist" or only a "war measure" as it was during World War I. The State Plan had become part of the very organism of capital Grund in the Great Depression, fearful of proletarian revolutions, determined to survive at all costs, be it state control or world war, or a nuclear holocaust— that is to say, destruction of civilization itself.

On the other hand, the proletariat has no intention whatever to let that happen. Its struggles against that are ceaseless, although the forms of resistance, of necessarily manifest themselves in new forms. Thus low labor productivity, far from being a sign of the "backwardness" of the Russian proletariat, is the measure of his resistance to the State Plan, the State Party, the Leader.

The masses have proven they cannot be brainwashed. All the means of communication may be in the hands of the state, but the heads belong to the same bodies that are being exploited, and they think their own thoughts.

By the time they openly rebel, their spontaneous outburst has opened new roads to freedom, to totally new human relations as well as to working out a new relationship between theory and practice. Such a new epoch opened in the 1950's when, at one and the same time, the second Industrial Revolution had begun with Automation, and the world against it, in the U.S., and, in East Europe, results within totalitarian lands broke out.

(To be Concluded Next Issue)

(3) Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. I., p. 639. See also what I wrote in Marxism and Freedom: "The single capitalist, call him 'Collective Leadership under Khrushchev,' if you will, will have at a certain stage a magnificent plant, completely automated, or a Jet bomber, but he cannot stop to raise the standard of living of the masses of the workers. He may be able to avoid the more extreme forms of ordinary commercial crises, but even within the community itself he cannot escape the internal crisis of production... That is why Marx, throughout Capital, insists that either you have the self-activity of the workers, the plan of freely organized labor, or you have the hierarchical structure of relations in the factory and the depressing Plan. There is no in-between." (p. 135).
a deliberately abstract discussion of the dialectics, "the negation of the negation" (4)—there was no doubt whatever that the masses in revolt were a new breed. Even as simple a slogan as "Bread and Freedom" pointed to new ways of uniting economics and philosophy. The historic, the unique, the new initiated in East Germany in 1953, climaxd in Hungary in 1956, returned in the 1960's throughout East Europe and culminating in Czechoslovakia in 1968 (5), and, as the Polish strikes at the end of 1970 showed, the resistance has not yet ended. All these epochal developments have yet to be grasped by intellectuals for what they are, a movement from practice both in freedom and to theory, a still developing new dialectics of liberation.

Paradoxically, the state-capitalist tendency which had looked towards just such spontaneous outbreaks, had enthusiastically hailed the East German uprising, failed to meet the challenge to theory from practice. While I had begun to pace, the moment Stalin died, the question of the relationship between philosopher and revolution, the working out of a new relationship between theory and practice that would be rooted both in actuality and in dialectics, (6) the co-founder of the Tendency was moving away from open Marxism. Whether that was due to the fact that McCarthyism was in full bloom in the U.S. or was due to his changed attitude to nationalism, the indisputable fact is that he glorified first West Indian nationalism, then Cuba, and then raised Nkrumah to the level of Lenin, if not a match above.

"(When I first read Johnson's statement, "in one of the remarkable episodes in revolutionary history, he (Nkrumah) single handedly outlined a programme based on the ideas of Marx, Lenin and Gandhi...", I wrote: "I admit that combining Marx, Lenin and Gandhi is quite a feat. But for a pamphleteer like J. R. Johnson who thundered so for the Soviet United States of Europe, Soviet United States of Asia, world revolution, the struggle against bureaucracy as such, the self-embellishment of the masses and for new paths and new forces to reconstruct society on totally new foundations—now with Nkrumah as representative of the new, the new, is rather pathetic. There is nothing to add but to say with Malakal, "Asha, poor Yuri, I knew him."") (Afro-Asia Revolutions, supra, p. 116)."

"(7) Perhaps this is the place to comment not only on what J. R. Johnson had written on Nkrumah, but also on his sudden rewriting of the history of the state-capitalist tendency.

Johnson's pamphlet from which I quoted p. 7, was called "Facing Reality and the Truth", as Appendix, a fantastic rewrite of the history of the state-capitalist tendency upon which I did not bother to comment. The steadfastness to reality calling itself Facing Reality has since then, however, not only rewritten the history of; but also published the Tendency document itself, State-Capitalism, and World Revolution, as if it were a product of C. L. R. James alone. If we are to believe Martin Glaberman, who writes the preface to this new publication, "he was the author of the C. L. R. James. Perhaps this will help to place James, who wrote for a number of years under the pseudonym of J. R. Johnson, in a truer light as a major inheritor and continuator of the Marxist tradition."

One thing can be said for Martin Glaberman. As against the sudden long list of names appended as prefaces to the republication of the document in England in 1968, all of whom had nothing to do with the writing of the document, and some of whom were adherents, not of the state-capitalist tendency, but of bureaucratic-collectivism, Martin Glaberman is an exposant of the state-capitalist theory. Too bad that since his grandiose pronouncements, above, he too has separated himself from James, who had not only split the state-capitalist tendency, but also split from the co-author of Facing Reality. It was left to Paul Buhle and Radical America (Vol. IV, No. 4, May 1970) to present "with the encouragement of C. L. R. James" a new collection, without any compunction what so ever to elice which are Tendency documents, and which are individual writings, on any subject whatever, if it is a malnourished worthy of neo-socialist American education.


(7) See Articles: "Exchange of Letters on Hegel's Absolute Idea, May 17, May 20, May 27, 1933" which appeared as Appendix in the micrographic edition of Extracts of Lenin's Philosophical Notebooks (Notes & Letters, November, 1958)."

"CULTURE", SCIENCE AND STATE-CAPITALISM.

by Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of Marxism and Freedom

PART II

Like the removal of an encumbrance from the brain, the death of Stalin, in March, 1953, released fantastic, elemental creativity on the part of the proletariat. Within these short months, the first uprising ever against Communist totalitarianism erupted in East Germany. This initiated a totally new epoch of freedom struggles in East Europe. The "Polish October" had not actually developed into a full revolution, but the ideological, struggles, especially among the youth, were spectacular, many-sided, passionate and brought Marxism onto the historic stage.

The revolts culminated in a full-scale revolution in Hungary in 1956. With the establishment of a new form of workers' "rule—Workers' Councils—the workers had created also the decentralized form of relationships for all other sectors of the population so that we had Councils of Revolutionary Youth, Councils of Intellectuals as well as a proliferation of parties, newspapers, free minds.

No matter what one's point of concentration was in those three years between the East German uprising and the Hungarian Revolution—before the Russian tanks moved in to crush the revolution, when the Russians feared the possibility of revolution, they had launched

(4) See Marx's Working Out of the Materialist Dialectics in the Economical-Philosophical Manuscripts of the Year, 1844" by V. I. Karpluskin. This article (Vspisy Filosofii 2/3 (1955)) has never been translated into English. Although many other attacks appeared, none were as "philosophic" as this. Nor is it possible, now that Kruschev has become an unperson and the 21st Congress of the Party has been played down, to see, how from open attacks on the Humanism of Marxists, the bureaucracy suddenly tried to usurp it for its own use by having the reeling philosopher, Malal, then declare Kruschev's report to contain "the magnificent and noble conception of Marxism-Leninism socialist humanism" (1), I have traced through the changes of line on the subject of Humanism for the years, 1945-56 in Nationalism, Terrorism, Marxist Humanism and the Afro-Asia Revolution, p. 220. (Left Group, Cambridge University Labour Club, England, 1961.)
(continued from Page 5)

above all, the objectivity of the specific form of Marx's philosophy of liberation was exalted by great masses of people having nothing whatever to do with ideological notions that appear in factional form, and everything to do with their spontaneous struggles for freedom under a concrete banner of liberation. The socialism "with a human face" was exalted first by the East Europeans who were fighting for freedom from Communism, then by the African Revolution gaining freedom from Western imperialism, and even, at first, by Castro defeating both internal reaction and U.S. imperialism. (8)

The whole new, Third World that was born saw any "leadership" from the Communist world led to the historic split is that orbit, not because either the Russian or Chinese Communist Parties were moving together with these new "storms centers of world revolution," but because both state powers were fighting for direction and control, and, (especially the latter), a world movement which emerged spontaneously, independent of all existing state powers-East and West, private capital, or state-capitalists calling themselves Communist.

It is true that, at first, Marx's Communism appeared as the greater force of attraction—in theory, with its dictum that "power comes out of the barrel of a gun," in practice, with the "Great Leap Forward" which promised to "kill both capitalism and socialism, and go "directly" to Communism. When, however, it had become clear that the "Great Leap Forward" had ended in great disaster, and when U.S. imperialism chose to throw the gauntlet (filled with dumpsters, barbed wire bombs), not to mighty China, but to little North Vietnam, the Third World kept away from both ends of the Euro-Soviet conflict, surviving, instead, with North Vietnam.

1965 ended disastrously for all of China's "foreign policy," but also for its "Great Leap Forward"—which culminated in the Cultural Revolution, soon after the earlier, "Sino-Soviet Friendship" period ended and was countered both the U.S.-NATO axis and the Moscow-Warsaw Pact Nations, was one of the results of "foreign policies" as the product of a "revolution that it was the type of revolutionism, that sparked the 1965 period which originated in the failure of the Great Leap Forward and now held that, in place of "one day and 30 years," it would take no less than a "century"—or more! (1) to establish socialism. What preceded the "Cultural Revolution" of 1966, and may, indeed, be called its first form—the Socialist Education Campaign (1962-3)—resulted on an attack on Marx's Humanist Essays. (9) Though, in the 1960's, it was directed mainly against "Russian revisionism," the truth is that both Russia and China decided jointly to call the East European Freedom Fighters "revisionists." The Russian

theorizers maintained their leadership of the Communist world and ground the struggle with alleged revisionism in a "criterion of Marx's Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts because that had become the banner of the revolutionary proletarian opposition to existing Communism.

The only contribution the Chinese Communists made to this struggle with revisionism was to constantly accuse their victims of wishing to establish "Potech circles" in China! (10). Then, when the Sino-Soviet conflict erupted, the Chinese added the adjective, Russian, before the noun. "revisionism," without, however, crossing either the adjective, Hungarian or Russian. Clearly, a specie is indeed housing Communism, hailing from below, from practice the specie of Marx's Humanities.

Both plant Communist state powers were alike also in subscribing science for the self-sufficiency of the masses as the "good" of the "superiority" of their social order, thereby proving, instead, the correctness of Marx's Humanist attack on science: "To have one basis for life and another for science is a priori a lie."

THE LIE OF SCIENCE

This is where state-capitalism calling itself Communism shows its affinity to private capitalism. Since, however, science's "essential" is the (human) survival of the human (much less China) has not yet "caught up" with U.S. industrial might, both Communist powers are looking for trade. And, since there is no way for U.S. industry might to escape economic crises and strikes and opposition movements from youth to anti-war in Black revolutions, it too wants trade. The present nullification with China has, of course, other "balancing" features in mind as it competes with Russia for world mastery. But nothing changes basics: the infeasibility of state-capitalism, as of private capitalism, due to the exploitation of labor, reveals the more closely science's insufficiency.

In a word, the "science" of science shows itself nowhere more glaringly than in the attitude to labor. Thus, Khurshchik, at the height of his power, proclaimed: "It is only logical that—the conscious working class would have . . . blazed a trail into outer space." When, however, the masses of praise to science came down to earth, they turned out to be pure capitalist admonitions for workers to work hard and harder. (11) Thus, while Mao condoned the superiority of science into the Cultural Revolution itself, the dictum for labor remained what it had been through "Great Leap Forward," all on the basis of that labor, more concretely spelled out: "Each person must work ten hours and engage in ideological studies for two hours a day, they are entitled to one day of rest every ten days."

(8) See especially Mao, On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People.

(9) See Chen Yong, "The Fighting Tank Crewmen of Workers in Philosophy and the Social Sciences," speech delivered at the 4th Expanded Session of the Committee of the Department of Philosophy and Social Science of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Oct. 26, 1962: "The modern revisionists and some bourgeois scholars try to describe Marxism as humanism... In particular, their make use of several views on 'alienation' expressed by Marx in his early Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts, 1844... in the early stage of development of their thought, Marx and Engels were indeed somewhat influenced by humanism ideas... In their later stage, because of the so-called 'elicited' conception of history and the class struggle is the motive force of social development, they immediately rid of this influences."

(10) See next page.
By no accident whatever, glorification of science is the mark not only of the ruling classes in the age of "scientific and technological revolutions," but also of ideologues busy revising Marxism. Not the deliberate Stalinist misreading of revolutionary proletarian opposition as "counterrevolution," but the genuine historic revolts have always used "science" in the fight against "the Hegelian dialectic," which turned out to be the fight against the proletarian revolution, for the "defense of the fatherland." Eduard Bernstein was the first, back at the end of the 19th century; Louis Althusser is the latest, but he is sure not to be the last since, of necessity, those proponents of "science" and opponents of "philosophy" are sure to keep reappearing so long as capitalism is not torn up, root and branch, the world over.

What concerned us here was, on the one hand, the achievements of the state-capitalist theory which kept revolutionaries from falling into Stalinist into imperialist war, and, by relating the new stage of world capitalist development to the specific forms of workers revolt against it, aligning with the latter. On the other hand, the inadequacy of the state-capitalist theory which, without development into Marxian-Humanism, could not cope with the actual movement from practice that refused to be only the sounds of revolution and let intellectuals do the theorizing.

The masses—all the new forces of revolution—have shown how different proletarian "subjectivity" is from petty-bourgeois subjectivity. They refuse any longer to be only the forces of revolution, for they are also its reason, active participants in working out the philosophy of liberation for our age. Now that they have done so, isn’t it time for intellectuals to begin, with them, to fill the theoretic void left in the Marxist movement since Lenin’s death? At no time has this been more imperative than now when a new generation of revolutionaries has been born, but is so disgusted with “the old” as to turn away from both theory and history as if actions, without these unifying forces of historic and theoretic continuity, can devise shortcuts to revolution. Jean-Paul Sartre’s advice to youth to reject history misunderstands a “newness” that treats history as if it weren’t there and builds itself to protest. A Hitler with his Mein Kampf could break with history; a revolutionary youth cannot. Nor can one continue to笃信 that theory can be gotten “en route.” To turn one’s back on philosophy is as big a lie as is the lie of science separated from life.

Marks forever the impasse of modern science not because he was a prophet, but because he had made human beings the subject of all development and saw that there was no other answer to can mankind be free in an age when the machine is master of man, and man of machine. There is still no other answer. It is from this ground that we today face what Hegel called “the birth-time of history” and Marx called the unity of theory and practice, of philosophy and revolution, of mental and manual labor, the new human dimension, “thoroughgoing Humanism.”

May 3, 1971

(11) The just-concluded 24th Congress of the Russian Communist Party reiterated that it was most based on the Congress a full decade ago, the full concentration on labor productivity remains. And the 1961 Program was most explicit:

- It is necessary to raise the productivity of labor by more than 100 per cent within ten years. To increase labor productivity and reduce production costs...implies a higher rate of increase in labor productivity as compared with remuneration... (and in) the second decade every family, including newlyweds, will have a comfortable flat conforming to the requirements of hygiene and cultured living.)
EDITORIAL ARTICLE

Nixon to Pekings: ‘journey to peace’ or to new alliance for world war?

by Raya Dunayszynska, National Chairman NEWS & LETTERS COMMITTEE

The Nixon speech that didn’t rate headlines was his July 4th address to newspaper editors in Kansas City. Since no one knew then that Nixon’s chief National Security Advisor, Henry Kissinger, was secretly flying to China with just such a “position paper” for the more receptive ears of Chou En-lai, the not-so-alert daily press missed the new slant in global power politics. Suddenly Nixon christened Mao’s China a “superpower” that would determine the world “economic future and... the future of the world in other ways in the last third of the century.”

China about to ride roughshod over North Vietnam

Within nine days Nixon knew how to rate headlines the world over. He asked for prime TV and radio time, letting none know what the speech was to be about: or how long it would last. Never before have 90 seconds so shaken the world. The part of that minute and half of which America was in Vietnam would visit Peking was being made public simultaneously in Mao’s China which, until that moment, had designated Nixon as “a god of plague and war.”

Whether or not what is now more talk, will, in fact, become the global turning point of “the century,” there is no doubt at all that the alleged super-revolutionary, Mao, has taken the actual super-revolutionary Nixon off the hot seat on which he was placed by the Vietnamese meat of all, but with them also by the massive U.S. anti-Vietnam war movement as well as the Black Revolution.

None of the millions on July 15th who were listening to Nixon’s 1½ minute talk (that took hours of methodical doubletalk to work out) could have been more shocked than the Vietnam and North Vietnamese. Mme. Binh tried bravely whistling in the dark. China would never, she said, settle with Nixon over the heads of the Vietnamese. But soon the terror of a doublecross showed through.

For how long can one cover up terror at betrayal when unexplained events of the past month fall into place?

Thus clearly, (1) the reason Nixon hardly wept when his only “patrician” covering on the hot seat—demand for release of American POW’s—had been pulled from under him by the Vietcong/North Vietnam peace proposals which offered to release all POW’s; and (2) the reason Kissinger paid no attention whatever to the peace negotiators in Paris who had offered to meet him “in private,” was that Mao-Chou were secretly negotiating with Nixon/Kissinger at the expense of the Vietnamese.

The Vietnamese masses had brought down the American, Gullith, only to find themselves facing the enemy from within the Communist orbit. What Mao had in store for the Vietnamese came out when the Australian Labor Party Leader, Gareth Whibley, that same week, reported that Chou En-lai favored a “Geneva type” conference, that is to say, a repeat of the so-called peace conference in 1954, at which China and Russia had compelled Viet nam, despite its victory over French imperialism at Dien Bien Phu, to accept the partition of their country into North and South.

The jolted outcry of North Vietnam—and, the solidarity of the anti-Vietnam war movement the world over with it—caused the China News Agency to claim that this was not what China meant. But this denial cannot be taken seriously, since not a single step has been taken to stop the secret dealings for the Nixon trip. The truth is that ever since the Sino-Soviet split became the Sino-U.S.

Soviet conflict, the possibility of war between these two state-capitalist giants calling themselves Communist has predominated over all else.

The recognition of this as the centerpiece for the planned Nixon-Mao meeting led to North Vietnam finally finding its tongue. Still counseled as an attack only on Nixon, it could easily enough be read as a questioning of Mao. Thus, Nixon’s, the official New York newspaper, in its criticism of Nixon for “roaming about wildly in search of a way out,” stated also that “he has gone to the wrong place. The exit door has been opened, yet he has stumbled into an impasse.”

Paris, the paper said, is where the representatives of the people doing the fighting are working out ways to peace, and it is with them Nixon must negotiate. The very description of what Nixon was doing, was pointing toward Mao “dividing the socialist countries, winning over one section and pitting it against another in order to oppose the national liberation movement and carry out a counter-revolutionary pacifist revision in the socialist countries.”

Now, no matter what designation counter... (Continued on Page 1)
Nixon to Peking: 'journey to peace' or to new alliance for war?

(Continued from Page 3)

US ENTERS SINO-SoviET CONFLICT

"10 years overdue," read the jubilant approval of the new Nixon line of rapprochement with China. When the Sino-Soviet conflict burst into the open in 1969, part of academe has been whispering into the ears of various Administrations that (1) there was no reason why "we" needed fear that Mao's revolutionary verbiage was directed against the US; the contiguous enemy No. 1, for China, was Russia, not the US; (2) that the Communist world wasn't a "monolith," which meant the US had global elbow room; and that, therefore (3) peaceful co-existence with China was both possible and desirable. Why entertain illusions about the bear hug of a country astride both Asia and Europe who had placed missiles in Cuba?

The last person in the world, however, who academe thought would initiate a 180-degree turn in foreign affaire was Nixon who had renounced prominence under the McGarthy banner, been a pupil of the Eisenhower-Dulles Portomannism gloating the globe, via NATO, SEATO and CENTO, not to mention Nixon's friendship with the ultra-reactionary China Lobby.

Yet, while the scholars were thinking of going at it "step by step," dreaming about China's admission to the UN with a seat on the Security Council (that is, with veto power), Nixon is moving on so many fronts all at once that he left out the cold, not merely academe, but Taiwan and Japan, which means the whole of East, South and Southeast Asia. What is called into question is the "Nixon Doctrine" itself. from "détente" to "agitation," from "peace in the Middle East" to "agitation in China". If one goes in all areas of reactionary alliances, stretching from Indochina to South Korea and from the Philippines to Japan. All old alliances are new up for grabs.

Whether or not the Nixon trip to Peking comes off as presently planned, whether or not Mao's China can get North Vietnam to agree to a repeal of a 1964-type of Big Power conference (sans Russia); and whether or not a Sino-American alliance would ever become a reality, primarily against Russia, the fact is the very prediction of a Max-Nixon meeting breeds, if not several double crosses, surely the possibility of the most fantastic political reshuffle since the end of World War II, Mao's conquest of power in China, and the Korean War.

THE WORLD CRISIS, PAX AMERICANA, AND MAO'S "CULTURAL REVOLUTION"

The 1969 ended with a disclosure that overwhelming world crises keep appearing in the post-World War II world even during periods of prosperity. First and foremost, there is the truth that world economic development be it private, mixed or state-capitalist calling itself Communism, is in a generalized state of stagnation. Not only has it been impossible to industrialize the technically underdeveloped countries that are in chronic crises, but the Big Powers themselves, by the very nature of their policies, are in a forced state of non-militarization and experiencing "miraculous" rates of growth, like West Germany and Japan, can nevertheless not reach "full automation," much less full employment, not to mention that, without militarization, they do not carry weight in this imperialistic world.

CHINA: VOICES OF REVOLT

Excerpts from the document "Whither China?", written by a revolutionary opposition group inside China itself, SHENG-WU-LIEN. It is a strong attack on "the bourgeois state machine."—Of Course!
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Put differently, extraction of ever greater amounts of unpaid hours of labor from living labor being the motive force of production, while the method of production calls for ever greater machines and ever heavier amounts of living labor, makes the crisis total. That "affluence" notwithstanding, present-day capitalism is still faced with a deep in the rate of profit, no matter how mass the mass. The result is a generalized global state of economic stagnation which keeps the world in social crisis moving in a circle of perpetual economic recessions, phenomenal militarization, actual wars, and back again down the same path of crises.

Secondly, friendly trade wars being as characteristic of capitalism as actual class wars, the US is now being subjected to savage competition from Japan and a challenge to its dollar standing by West Germany. So serious is the situation that Nixon, this January, created a Council on International Economic Policy to be the counterpart to his National Security Council which just initiated the Nixon-Mao talks. In its current form, facts cannot hide the reality: the end of the Korean War did not regularize for Pax Americans its place in the world market. From 1950 to 1970 the share of the US in trade of industrialized countries dropped from one-third to one-fifth of world trade. The Commerce Department last month announced that for the first time since 1950, not only had the US exported less than it purchased from abroad, but if the deficit continues throughout the year (and, with the Vietnam war expenditures continuing, as will the deficits), it would signify something that had not happened in the US since 1929.

With neither unemployment nor inflation abating, even the "hard heel" will not vote for Nixon in 1972. In a word, we are once more to look at the breaking points—the Black Revolution and the Youth revolt, the anti-Vietnam war movement and Women's liberation, rank and file labor militating and official strikes—It is clear that what used to be called the "American way of life," much less the Nixon Administration, is not on the way of the majority of the American people.

As for the other Big Power, Russia has long since learned, that the state of economic stagnation, of militarization, of war, cannot be disentangled through the most grandiose Plans, Russia, too, was subjected both to economic crises and social revolts, especially in its satellites. Nor did this come about only in rebellious states like Czechoslovakia that fought for its freedom and was crushed by the tanks of the superpower, and not only in Poland, which had been the line in the field of foreign policy, but also in Italy and uprisings against economic oppression, excessive price rises, uncontrolled inflation, a stifling life.

That nothing short of a social revolution can totally avoid the capital-labor relations in the modern world can be seen also in that allegedly most revolutionary land, China, during the so-called Cultural Revolution. Ostensibly directed against "capitalist forms" and "bourgeois" it was in fact, a preventive civil war against the Chinese masses, including the youth who had taken seriously Mao's dec.

(Continued on Page 7)
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iratation that “it is right to rebel.” All one has to do to see the real conditions in China is to read “Whither China,” the document of that extraordinary revolutionary phenomenon, Sheng-Wu-lien.***

At the moment, Mao and Chou take great pains to explain that they have put down the “ultra-left,” and, indeed, they couldn’t move to opposite, so shamelessly, into the dirty arena of class-compromising politics when there has been a “second revolution.” Instead, the poverty, the exploitative relations, the workers demanding different conditions of labor, the actual strikes in the cities, and general discontent in country, as well as the critical international situation, from the collapse of the Djibouti-Peking axis to near-war conditions with Russia, compelled the rulers to take a “deeper” look at the world as is.

At one and the same time, the rulers of China put down the “ultra-left,” added the country with a Constitution in which the military in the decisive force and General Lin Piao is already assisted as the one to rule after Mao’s death. On the international front, the biggest reversal is yet to come as they act out their “discovery,” that Nixon is “less bad.”

COUNTER-REVOLUTION BY ANY OTHER NAME

White this hardly equals the Russian accusation that public, but sent to those who side with Russia in the Communist world—that Mao’s China, for “nationalist, Chinese” reasons is aligning with U.S. imperialism against Russia. It does disclose that China is ready to play the same game Russia has been playing with the U.S.

Why should the Movement be interested in games the rulers of the world are playing? Shouldn’t it be all too obvious that in Big Powers, the “private capitalist or state-capitalist calling themselves Communist, the national liberation movements are expendable? Why for that matter “take sides” in breaks within the ruling class, be they the right wing critics of Nixon who claim that Mao-Chou are such shrewd bargainers that if we are sending such “novices” as Nixon-Kissinger, we belong also in Vida Blue? Or be they the proponents of Nixon who claim that Mao is taking the Nixon

**The Hunan Revolutionary Committee (Sheng-Wu-lien) has three of its documents published in China, and, there are new translations and reprinted in Peking and the New Left, by Nixon Meinhert, China Research Monographs, U.C. Berkeley, 1966. Key excerpts have been mimeographed by News & Letters.

Doctrine “seriously,” believe he is “fully” withdrawing U.S. troops from Indochina, and, “therefore,” China feels it can do business with the U.S.

Any such concerns would only lead to the greatest denunciation of all—the propagation of the view that Chou K f a i is only “flirting” with Nixon, but his heart, soul and “principles” are all in Vietnam. The only thing that China’s that is in Vietnam is its double tongue. The single grain of truth that makes possible any willful delusion is that Vietnam is not the centerpiece of China’s worry. Russia is. This being so, however, means that no price is too high to pay, including a defeat of Viet- nam. If, in exchange, Mao can either achieve an alliance against Russia, or see Russia engaged in a two-front war.

This should have been clear ever since U.S. Im- perialism started raiding bombs on North Vietnam in February, 1965, and yet China refused a united front with Russia in defense of North Vietnam. Indeed, the aid he did give was nowhere on the scale Mao’s China gave Pakistan in its war with India when Chinese troops were moved to the border with India. And Mao is stick- ing to that alliance with West Pakistan when the enemy is not India, but the East Pakistani masses, against whom the fascistic generals, with much military help from China, are practicing genocide.

As for U.S. Imperialism, it has no intention whatever of withdrawing all troops and arms from Vietnam unless the American people exude it is do so. From Nixon who aided French Imperialism to try to hold on to Indo- China, through Eisenhower-Kennedy-Johnson who created American puppets and turned the civil war into a full- scale American war, to Nixon who has to face the reality of the American defeat and the massive opposition at home by withdrawing the main body of the “land army” in Vietnam, but keeping “a residual force,” there has been no fundamental change in the basic line of keeping U.S. Imperialism dominant in Asia. With or without Nixon’s “allies,” U.S. imperialism is out for global mastery. And this it cannot hope to achieve unless the pro-Stalin revisionist opposition forces are destroyed.

It is here, at home, where the contest will be de- cided. There will be no peace anywhere any more than at home except through social revolution. It is here that Nixon will meet his Waterloo.

THE ANSWER IS AT HOME

The wars abroad go hand in hand with the uncon- cealing wars at home—against the Black Revolution, against, against the anti-Vietnam War movement, especial- ly the youth as its decisive force. Whatever Nixon

Nixon has about trying to win that 1972 election by going to Peking and thereby, he hopes, fragmenting the anti- Vietnam war movement, they will come to naught, pro- vided the Movement neither falls into the trap set by Mac’s “Cultural Revolution,” nor, at home, separates the anti-Vietnam war movement from the class struggles as well as the Black Revolution, much less keeps the struggles separated from a total philosophy of liberation.

Therefore, the demand for total and immediate with- drawal of American troops from Vietnam must show itself to be equally against any policies of world capital, East or West.

Therefore, the demand for national self-determina- tion for South Vietnam must not be subdivided into South Vietnam. Indeed, the national liberation move- ment in South Vietnam fought many years before it finally got support from North Vietnam. Self-determina- tion is violated when made dependent on any poles of the existing state powers, be it a bi-polar or a tri-polar world, or, for that matter, a world divided into capitalist blocs and Western Europe and Japan likewise demanding their “spheres of influence.”

This is the challenge the anti-Vietnam war move- ment must now face. Otherwise it will suffer fragmenta- tion. The more announcement of a projected Nixon-Mao meeting has already deflected from the courageous act of Daniel Ellsberg in making the secret Pentagon Papers public as well as blunt the impact of the revelations of the three decades of deceiving the American people. Just as we must not allow Nixon-McClellan to railroad Dr. Ells- berg to jail, so we must not allow the Nixon-McClellan orbit, in conflict or otherwise, to channelize our thinking and our doing. Only a Movement independent of all existing state powers can remake the world so totally new, truly human foundations because only its banner will be un- salled by exploitation and domination, its politics a source of mankind as its motive power. That is the only free- dom worth dying and living for.
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Scotland, England, France—and Marxist-Humanism

In Glasgow it is at the highest level since the Depression, with over 30,000 out of work already, 10% of the male work force (which is how the statistics count it; I suppose women out of work don’t count). The threatened closing of the shipyards would affect 5,000 more workers directly, and an additional 30,000 indirectly. The workers countered by threatening to occupy the shipyards and run them, themselves, and the papers today report they have done just that!

(Photographer: Steve Nicol, below)

In Britain as a whole, expectations are that unemployment will top a million by this winter, adding to the woes already piled on the working class by the Tory government. In only one year of Tory rule, inflation has risen by 10%, charges for children’s school meals have been increased, free milk has been abolished, and medical prescriptions and dental care costs have been raised.

On top of that, the most vicious anti-labor legislation, the Industrial Relations Bill, has just been passed. This bill makes our Taft-Hartley Slave Labor Act look like a pro-labor legislation. One key provision tells all that needs to be known: it will be against the law for a British worker to even advocate a strike! The bill requires unions which register in line with an agreement with the government not to strike. If a member of the union who talks about striking, he can be fined or jailed for contempt of court.

It is also clear that British racist threats to increase viciously. As unemployment worsens there is the fear that the colonial immigrants—East and West Indians, Pakistanis, Africans—will become the scapegoats. Bernard Lewis, whom we met at a rally she addressed in Edinburgh, said a hoard of opposing the Jews of the race, she got a warm round of applause from her heavily working-class audience when she pointed out that before they had the blacks to blame for everything, they blamed the Irish. And she tied it all to the need for labor to fight the Immigration Bill as fervently as they are fighting the Industrial Relations Bill. During the discussion period, we were also greeted warmly by the audience when we extended socialist greetings to the rally from the Second America.

ONE THING WE had expected to encounter at the meetings we had been invited to address (we spoke at nine—he-three in Scotland, and three in England) was the fact that U.S. workers were backward because they had their big mass Communist Parties or Labor Parties. But this did not happen at all. Not once. As a matter of fact, everyone we spoke with was very eager to hear of the activity of the workers in the U.K., and many of the people attending our meetings, realized that the U.S. workers in their struggle with Automation, could teach them plenty about what they had in store for them—unless their society was completely changed.

This was our experience in France as well. We did not have much opportunity there to speak with workers themselves, but had interviews with both the more traditional Left press and with the New Left press. We found them all in their column that American workers had been so co-opted into the system that they could not be considered a revolutionary force any longer. One reporter went so far as to ask if it is not correct to even speak of a working class in America? They appeared to be impressed with our news of what American workers are actually doing.

There has been a great amount of searching for answers since the recent revolts of May ’68 in France. The publication of the French edition of Marxism and Freedom, itself, is part of that development. New groups were formed when youth left their old parties in disarray and by now many of these groups have gone through further shifts and splits. The New Left youth we spoke with felt that their greatest task was any real links with the workers. They were especially struck by the fact that our editor is a worker. The several Trotskyist groups on the other hand, do have workers in their ranks—but the relationship between the workers and the intellectuals is not fundamentally any different than that of the Communist Party.

THE SAME THING was true in Britain. We found that the activists we met in the Women’s Liberation Movement were very struck with our pamphlet, Notes on Women’s Liberation, precisely because they felt our keenly their own lack of any links with the Black and working-class women, which our pamphlet demonstrated. The Trotskyists and the anti-Trotskyist-Trotskyists, etc. (Continued on Page 8)
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(Continued from Page 5)

the other hand, are all so permeated with the concept of the "backwardness of the workers," that some told us that the idea of having a worker as editor of our paper was "shocking" workers.

The idea that workers can not only speak for themselves, but that they are the source of all theory seems impossible for those who consider themselves the "vanguard" to conceive. They are so concerned with becoming "mass" organisations, with influencing the struggle by proposing the best strategy, that they cannot see that "organisation" begins with organisation of your own thought. And for our age that means recognising that there is a movement from practice—from the actual struggles of our day—to theory, which demands a theory to meet it. Listening to the thoughts of the workers, the minorities, the woman, the youth, far from being intellectual abstraction, is the beginning of a new stage of cognition.

That is why we felt that of all the questions we were asked—and we were asked many—the most basic was raised by a young worker in Edinburgh, who asked simply: do you believe in the vanguard party? The conception of Vanguard party to lead equates the role of the revolutionary party with recruiting all of the advanced militant workers who, together with the leadership of the party, would lead the workers to socialist victory. All the workers would have to do is recognise that these leaders represented them and would create a new society in which the working class would be free. After the workers made the revolution, that is.

We pointed out the administrative mentality reflected in this conception of leadership, and the difference in the philosophy presented in the pages of Marxism and Freedom. But it is not easy to overcome such entrenched ideas. What helped to show the idea was our report of the continuing widest strike experiences of "right tactics," or the "right strategy," to which so much of the Left has reduced its politics is made more urgent than ever by the objective situation, which is explosive.

Your new introduction to the French edition, which analyses that crucial year, 1968—and the new appendix which reproduces the Sheng We Liem document as the new voices of revolt from inside China—are essential for the French Left to grapple with. And Harry McShane's new Preface to the British edition puts the challenge on the level of urgent necessity for that country.

In fact, Harry, who added a tremendous proletarian and philosophical dimension to all of our meetings, by bringing to the discussion of the event of June 1968, new dimensions to all of our discussions, made it possible for anyone to understand their own experience of history. He summed it up best at the meeting in Hull, where he denounced the dramatic situation of the Clyde Shipyard workers being discussed. As Harry put it:

"The question that has been raised by the shipyard workers is a very important one, and it seems obvious that it cannot be solved by the shipyard workers alone. The crisis of unemployment all over the country, and especially in Scotland and Northern Ireland, raises the question of the social order, the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a new social order. And that, of course, is the subject of Marxism and Freedom, where it is taken up without ignoring a single immediate issue. The immediate issue is bound up with the ultimate solution. When you ask, is industry trying to decide the future of tomorrow or is it trying to decide the future of industry and control his own destiny, you are asking the question that motivated Marx all his life. There is a vital connection between theory and the actual class struggles that cannot be ignored any longer."
Slanderous book review nailed by author’s reply

McCarthyite 1950’s criticized me as sharply as does the French reviewer in 1971, for carrying through the American roots of Marxism, from Marx’s day and his defense of the Abolitionists, to my heralding of the Black revolution initiated in our epoch by the Montgomery bus boycott of 1955-56. Permit me to quote from my comments when I contrasted the nascent capitalism which greeted my generation of the Black revolution to the treatment of the same revolution as a verbal cliché by the mid-1960’s: “Yet the fact that a revolution can be treated, as it is, by a more journalistic phrase only furthert reveals the failure to grapple with the truth that the American Negro has always been the touchstone of American civilization—this was an ever expanding frontier but an unyielding philosophy.” (p. 12) Evidently, Mr. Palmier considers the American roots of Marxism as outdated, that instead of citing any, he built himself with the contention that I was not in “de-Stalinization” of Marxism—or to put it more precisely in my own terminology, the criticism of Marxism and Leninism, as well as the transformation of the first workers’ state into its absolute opposite, state-capitalism, which Stalin (he it Rosten or of any other nationality) called Communism.

THE REVIEWER, not I, linked into a single unit (all duly hyphenated) “Legi-scale-Trotsky-Stalin-Maoist,” I, on the contrary, not only made the gulf between Stalin and Lenin unbridgeable, but also demonstrated that it was Lenin who saved Marxism when World War II caused the collapse of the then-established Marxism, the Second International. If the reviewer stopped reading before he reached page 198, the section entitled “Lenin and the Dictator: A Mind in Action,” he certainly had read the third paragraph of my special prefatory to the French edition, which states: “Thus, Lenin, to lay the theoretic foundations for November, 1917, ‘rescued’ Marx’s Civil War in France as State and Revolution...This every worker, every peasant, every laborer, every man who is exploited, the whole population to a man!”

Since Mr. Palmier considered my personal past as Trotsky’s secretary ‘not without interest,” may I recommend to him the document archives (“Raya Dunayevskaya Collection”), “Marxist-Humanism: Its Origin and Development in America,” 1941-1957,” available on microfiche through the Wayne State University Labor Library in Detroit, Michigan...”}

Raya Dunayevskaya
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The 'ground' for the Nixon-Mao meeting

by Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of Marxism and Freedom

Editor's Note: We print below excerpts from Raya Dunayevskaya's Perspectives Speech to The National Editorial Board meeting of News & Letters Committees. The full speech is available from News & Letters for 35 cents a copy.

... The reapparance of neo-fascism in Italy has reminded us - that not a single fundamental problem was solved by World War II...

... Japan had to be taught a lesson even if Nixon had to induce an economic and political crisis. The stonewall men went to war - a town in the town in which Lee Pino had used in his famous 1965 speech on war. I.e. the town was the whole globe. Nixon no sooner pulled the political shock of the post-war era in announcing his trip to Peking than he followed through with global economic change - and this time inside the American economy package. First came the induced gold crisis...

... Nixon slapped a 10% tax on imports. Albert both in West Germany and Japan, it hit Japan hardest, since no less than 30% of its trade is with the U.S. Not only that, most of Japan's Asian trade is based on the Asian rulers' belief that Japan will be the political power in the Pacific as it is its economic giant. Japan itself had every capitalistic right to believe that after its economy flourishes.

Now that all old alliances are up for grabs, will that, too, have to be scrapped? Even Russia, after decades of pre-occupation, has started to conclude that the American economy is ready for collapse.

... The ability of everything is very serious. Not only can much of the world's trade as the whole of the life of capitalism itself is at stake. Not since the end of the Second World War has the U.S. been faced with so much unemployment and inflation, so much economic, social, economic, political, and international crisis, to the point that the very basis of the world's economic, social, and political order is threatened.

We are even the most radical, the most hard-line, the most uncompromising, on the one hand. But on the other hand, we cannot allow the situation to get so bad that we will be forced to accept capitalist solutions. We must fight for socialist solutions that are our own. We must fight for a world that is not ruled by the capitalist class, but by the working class.

... We are facing a crisis, to escape the possibility of a social revolution - and it is such fears which transformed the President into a brutal man - were we even to exclude the new passions and new forces hungry for unrest capitalism, and keep the view of the crisis confined to the capitalist relations, it would still be a fact that not only is the U.S. being challenged by the other nuclear titan, Russia, that has moved into the Middle East with a sweep the U.S. has long dreamed about, but the U.S. is also being challenged by its private capitalistic allies - West Europe and Japan - when it has put on its economic coat after very nearly total destruction in World War II. It isn't that these countries aren't undergoing crises. The truth is - as the world crises continue to be at the end of that holocaust, that was the one victim who remained standing on its feet, the unchallenged Goliath the world over - the U.S. - has been incapable of establishing any Pax Americana. The absolute opposite is the case.

So real are the world crises, including those in the industrial-military-nuclear complex, that this Siberia has not been able to win over even little Vietnam.

Nor in it a question of a defeat rather than a victory. Rather, the totality of the crises - both abroad and at home - is such that the limits of capitalism itself is at stake. Not since the end of the Second World War has the U.S. been faced with so much unemployment and inflation, so much economic, social, political, and international crisis, to the point that the very basis of the world's economic, social, and political order is threatened.

... America, not Vietnam, is what Nixon calls an "honorably" way, the U.S. anti-Vietnam War movement will see to it that the 1972 election will surely be Nixon's.

... After all, what about China? Surely, it hasn't invited Nixon just to meet with the "right wing"? To China, Japan isn't the mere arrogant competitor Nixon wants to discriminate. Japan is the industrial giant of Asia. It started World War II against China two years in advance of WWII. Thus, there is that other giant, Russia, the continuous and ideological Enemy No. One, i.e. state-capitalist and world ally of China herself.

And, first and foremost, is that internal crisis. Recently China was providing the English statement - as he admitted (Interview with Edgar Snow, published in Epoch, 2/74) that the Cultural Revolution had caused chaos and "saw certain dimensions" in production. No figures were given to show just "how little." He claimed all plans had been fulfilled, but without giving figures, this time not even about population, though on all other occasions, 700 millions is always thrown about to show that China is in one-fourth of the world's population. In any case, he did admit it was "technologically backward" (indeed, he said also culturally backward!), and that it was a "poor country," not to mention what a very poor standard of living exists for the masses!

It is clear that the economic crisis is every bit as crucial as any foreign crisis...

... There is hardly a place on earth that Mao's China isn't playing power politics, be it with the racist genocidal regimes in Pakistan actually practising genocide on East Pakistan, or trading with South Africa as well as the military junta in Greece. Be it with "left" Palestinian "Liberal Front" and the nobles who have discovered for Coehoornstahl whom they had previously declared to be the worst of the resistance, or paying court to the Shah of Iran; and now it is, at one and the same time, talking about being all out for the Vietcong and North Vietnam while choosing Yehosh Rabin to be the intermediary to arrange for the secret meeting with Nixon, whom they now find "less bad."

... Not only is everything still very serious. Not only can much of the world's trade be reversed all sides. Not only are there things that are not Mao's, to give, as the Vietnam-North Vietnamese have shown by denouncing that Paris, not Peking, is the place to bargain. Without a way to get out of Vietnam is what Nixon calls an "honorably" way, the U.S. anti-Vietnam War movement will see to it that the 1972 election will surely be Nixon's.

... America, not Vietnam, is what Nixon calls an "honorable way," the U.S. anti-Vietnam War movement will see to it that the 1972 election will surely be Nixon's.

... America, not Vietnam, is what Nixon calls an "honorable way," the U.S. anti-Vietnam War movement will see to it that the 1972 election will surely be Nixon's.
Women's liberation: reason and revolutionary force

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom

Editor's note: We print below excerpts from an article by Raya Dunayevskaya included in "Notes on Women's Liberation: We Speak in Many Voices" (News & Letters, $1). After taking up Literature and History; the Black Dimension; and the Neutrons of Today's Women's Liberation Movement, the article deals with Marx's Humanism and Today's Marxist-Leninists.

THE WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT AS REASON AND AS REVOLUTIONARY FORCE

As against the past, all of the past, including some of the revolutionary past, and the women who made it, a man's world, today's Women's Liberation Movement not only refuses to stop short of total freedom, but refuses to wait for "the day after" the revolution to obtain it. On the contrary, she will be part of that historic process of making freedom rest for all.

What is involved now is a whole new philosophy. Where Hegel had moved the myth of Adam and Eve from the theology of sin to the sphere of knowledge, Marx looked at history as a development of labor, and, therefore, in the need of a totally new way of life, a philosophy of liberation he called the new humanism. In his early Humanist essays, he kept reiterating that so long as we talk only about different property forms, we will never get to new human relations, least of all the relationship of man to woman. Private property, Marx insisted, has made us so stupid that we think only of possessions. We are constantly substituting a "to have" for a "to be." But the abolition of private property would not alone, being a new society, as the vulgar communists thought; this, Marx insisted, only "negates the personality of man," not to mention the most fundamental of all relations, that of man to woman.

It is in this type of totally new relations that many in the Women's Liberation Movement are aspiring to.

INSTEAD OF EITHER grasping the link of continuity of today's struggles with that which Marx saw emerging, or listening to new voices, today's "Marxists" themselves are the best examples of ideology as fake consciousness. They look upon themselves as "the leaders," or at least the politicians who can offer a "rational reassessment of feminist ideology," and look down upon today's new women rebels as "apolitical," as if politics were the equivalent of a philosophy of liberation. They are insensitive to the distress the rebels entertain toward them because they cannot conceive that the Women's Liberation Movement has a point when it considers the politics as so much still another group that wishes to transform them into mere auxiliaries of other movements. Whether they are asked merely to form a "Committee to Support the Socialist Women's Party Candidates," or they are invited "to build a labor party," their disgust is the same. They are sure they are being used, when someone like Claire Muriel invites them to the wrong conclusions that "just as the Negro problem is, in reality, a white problem, the slogans 'chauvinism should be the concern of men.'"

The truth is the exact opposite. While socialists were busy proclaiming the impossibility for Negroes to solve the Negro problem "by themselves," the blacks proceeded to create their own independent mass movement. It is not labor or "socialism" which acted as catalyst for both the anti-war movement and, indeed, gave birth to a whole new generation of revolutionaries, but the black revolution which was both catalyst and reason, and continues to be that ceaseless movement today.

To hold that women rebells are now to consider male chauvinism "the concern of men" may sound as docile as Simone de Beauvoir's Second Sex (it is she who proclaimed it early and loudest), and may produce a few more women who have made it in a man's world. But the movement was created, not by her, but by these "apolitical" women who took matters into their own hands.

THE WHOLE ATTITUDE of today's "Marxists" to Women's Liberation is not helping, but endangering the movement just when it is trying to overcome its own empiricism and distort of ideologies and is beginning to search for theory, for a total philosophy that is a way of life in search of other life forces of liberation who would look to be whole men as they look to be whole women. Communists, Socialists, Trotskyists, Maoists and...

*Most of the quotes that follow are from Claire Muriel's article, "On Women's Liberation," New Politics, Spring 1970. However, I am actually taking issue with the whole left, old and new—Communists, Maoists, Trotskyists, independent socialists. It just happens that Claire Muriel has expressed these political views best.

Notes on Women's Liberation
We Speak in Many Voices
Black, Chicana; Oriental, White
A new force for freedom... student, worker, youth, adult, theory and practice.

Price $1.00
Includes "The Women's Liberation Movement as Reason and as Revolutionary Force" by Raya Dunayevskaya
Order from: News & Letters
9 1920 E. Jefferson, Detroit, Mich. 48207
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Historical Materialism. She so sharply separates the ideal from the material that she can write: “Given our position as historical materialists, we understand that changes in consciousness do not precede but accompany institutional change, hence, it is relatively fruitless for women to attempt to combat male chauvinism.”

There the cat finally is out of the bag. Along with the concept of the backdoor of the political women is the concept of the immobility of the males from their dominant position. Poor Marx! To all the vulgarization the bourgeois attributes to his discovery of historical materialism, we now have an independent socialized blazoning that historic discovery for making it “relatively fruitless for women to attempt to combat male chauvinism.”

Material conditions, it is true, determine consciousness, not vice versa, as we look at a historical stretch of the development of masked through history. History is present, in dialectics. Every coin is invested with its opposite. The future is inherent in the present. The opponent forces to the existing society not only fight it, but gain the consciousness both about the significance of their fight and aggrandization of a direction toward that future. Otherwise Marx would never have been able to work out a philosophy of revolution; we would have remained the one-dimensional men and women. Herbert Marcuse thinks we are...

THE UNIQUENESS of today’s Women’s Liberation Movement is that it dares to challenge what is, including the male chauvinism not only under capitalism but within the revolutionary movement itself and speaking even with female voices. To fear to expose this male chauvinism leads to helplessness. To face reality, and to face it not through sheer voluntarism, but with full awareness of all the forces lined up against us, is the one way to assure the coherence with other revolutionary forces, especially labor which is so strategically placed in production and has its own black dimension. So long as we will not fully overcome male chauvinism so long as class society exists. But we can and will break up its monolithism. We can and will witness the development of women themselves not only as force but as reason. We can and will be a catalyst not only for our development as all-round human beings, but also for that of men. The first step in that direction is to meet the challenge as it appears: squirrelism as it appears, any time it rouses its head, under no matter what disguise. The first act of liberation is to demand back our own heads.
And China makes Three

Super powers line up as new war explodes between India, W. Pakistan

by RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA
Chairman, National Editorial Board

Open war broke out between West Pakistan and India on Dec. 3. Prodded by the U.S., the Security Council of the UN rushed into special session to consider the Resolution calling for "a cease fire." It displayed an absurdity it failed to see either when the U.S. dropped bombs on Vietnam, a belligerent imperialist war it keeps up to this day, the seventh year, or when Russia invaded Czechoslovakia in 1968. Whether the present speed is due to the fact that now—that China is in the UN, there are three super-powers, or whether it is easier to deal with middle powers, the rush was needless. The veto power of the super-powers exposes the UN's built-in impotence.

U.S., CHINA, RUSSIA

Russia vetoed the Resolution in an emotionally-charged speech about the issue at stake being neither West Pakistan nor India but the liberation of East Pakistan. It must assuredly be true that the question in Pakistan is the East Pakistani mass struggle for independence from its Big Brother, the exploitative West Pakistani state which had invaded the Bengali nation after it voted overwhelmingly for autonomy. For India, much less Russia, however, it is not true that they support it because they are great exponents of the national liberation struggle. Rather, they began to support it only after they discovered a way to use it for specific chauvinistic purposes even as China is supporting West Pakistan for its global purposes.

In a word, the tragedy is the same as before: the Spanish Civil War. Just as Nazi Germany and Stalin's Russia were using that struggle as the European testing ground for World War II, so now the East Pakistani liberation struggle is being used—this time by three superpowers—as the Asian testing ground for World War III.

At first the U.S. tried speaking out of both sides of its mouth. "Absolute neutrality" means accusing India of "aggression," though it also had to admit that "the beginning of the crisis can fairly be said to be the use of force by Pakistan." It is not accidental, of course, that Nixon found it easier to recognize an affinity to the West Pakistani fascists than to the liberation forces that had underpinned a guerriadal war against the East Pakistanis for five years from its Big Brother. No less than 70 million East Pakistani refugees streamed into India.

China, however, understood perfectly. It voted for the U.S. Resolution, but did not ask for a vote on its own Resolution, and proceeded to lobby energetically not only for calling India "the aggressor" and totally absolv- ing the West Pakistani military junta, but also for demanding the end of Bangla Desh (the Bengali Nation), the national liberation front when it declared to be a "social imperialist plot." (Before the Resolution vote between Mao and Nixon, China used to call it "a CIA plot").

In the specific instance of China it is also a way to bring the Sino-Soviet struggle into the US as well as "teaching" the UN that when it comes to global purpose, civil wars may be reduced to the Maoist version of "a social-imperialist plot."

THE BANGLA DESH

China did more than turn a deaf ear to the mild telegram from Mr. Shotton and the Awan Party to Mao in April. "The ideology of imperialism is to fight oppression . . . and if Mao refuses to protest against the atrocities of the military junta, the world may think you are not the friend of the oppressed." China was at that very moment aiding the West Pakistani military junta in its continued massacre of its own people as well as assigning Pakistan a prestige job: assisting in the secret trip of Kissinger to Peking.

With such superpower attempts for new world realignments in the works in April, of what concern was the Bangladesh to the "pure revolutionary" Mao?

None can know the consequences of the Bangladesh "Government" now that it has allowed India to sit it for its own war with Pakistan. Indeed, there are two governments in India, one, Red, because of the three superpowers alining for world mastery.

We are yet to see what happens to a national liberation movement that is the East Pakistanis when it subordinates its movement to another capitalistic government, instead of working out a common front with the West Pakistani masses who are equally exploited by the same military junta—and who are carrying on a struggle against its rulers that was strong enough to undermine Ayub Khan. Some West Pakistan scholars in this country not only had great sympathy for the East Pakistan struggle, but full awareness of the global implications.

Thus, one, Yojith Ahmed (1), wrote: "The leaders of the Awan League in East Pakistan failed to understand how important West Pakistan was to the Nixon-Kissinger strategy of building an informal anti-Soviet alliance of dependable clients around the Mediterranean and Indian oceans—from Spain and Portugal through Greece and Israel, to Iran and Pakistan." Meanwhile it is the Indian and Pakistani masses who are the victims. The war goes on while superpower plots are hatched.

NIXON'S CHANGE OF COURSE

Judging by the present U.S. action in the UN—what had originally appeared to accidental—the first Kissinger trip to Pakistan (April 1971) was a failure. Clearly, nothing—absolutely nothing—is permitted to divert from that, that new and new wars alliances.

Thus, though crucial to that change to constant the possibility that Mao could get Nixon off the hot seat in the Vietnam war, there was no deviation in the main course even when North Vietnam made it as clear as to Mao, as to Nixon, that it would under no circumstances become a pawn in a new Big Power game simply because the locale would be changed from Geneva to Peking. The time between the 1965 "peace" and 1972 war has been endless war for the Vietnamese—and the Chine- ese or Russians, but for the Vietnamese alone.

Thus, when Congress was shocked at the callous Nixon policy of not cutting military hardware to Pakistan in time of its harsh war against its own people and voted an end to monies set aside for Pakistan, Nixon still found ways to keep doors open to the military junta China supported. This is further reinforced by the U.S. delegation's present maneuvers in the UN.

The July 10 issue of this magazine was an analysis to assure Mao of non-concern about the power struggle within China, and anxiety about his own trip, that no sooner did rumors appear about the fall of Lin Piao than Chairman Mao was once again rushed off to Peking. This time he finalized the date of the trip—three days after Washington's Birthday.

The Chinese must be held indeed to account for such persistency in the wording of China and for Mao's emphasis on Nixon in favor of U.S. continuing war in Vietnam, not to mention his own previous "philosophy" of U.S. imperialism as the world's Enemy No. 1. Isolated to such historic global turnabout, who among the rulers has time to pay attention to a national liberation movement as that of the East Pakistanis? All rulers are interested in is one thing: how to throttle the national liberation movement and keep it from spoiling the big game!

CHINA, IN AND OUT OF THE UN

...In their first three weeks of China's presence at the UN, the one subject on which China seemed to set its old self regarding U.S. imperialism, as well as "playing China's own low profile" role of a non-power, was the vote in the United Nations against the U.S. decision to trade with Rhodesia. Unfortunately, for any who knew China's past —is it only past? —on the question, it too, contained a latent shock. Back in 1966, when not only had the UN called for an embargo on trade with racist Rhodesia, but Mao himself had engaged in "one more battle—in many ways the most audacious and astounding of his life" (2) to the so-called Chinese Revolution, the Communist China bought some 10 million dollars' worth of Rhodesian tobacco as a type of fake revolutionism to pacify the masses which was manifest in China's current announced stand for the "Palestinian revolutionary cause." Chiao Hsiao-ho had been separated from the UN resolution which had called upon Israel to return all lands occupied by it in the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, pointing out that China "merely" supports Palestinians to regain land lost in 1948.

In a word, Mao's China does not recognize the creation of Israel and is for her being driven into the same black hole. This now trumps to the East Pakistanis and open anti-Semitic Al-Shahary to propagandize that doesn't even know her. But what has happened to the Arab countries, and China alone has never recognized Israel. He had not been let in to inform his Arab listeners in 1967 (3) any more than had Chiao Hsiao-ho in 1972 called the UN's attention to the simple fact that China's itself had not yet been born. All these hidden chickens will first come to roost later. For the moment what is crucial—not only in relationality to the India-Pakistan war but also, and above all, to the UN—within China and it is to this we must turn if we are serious to grapple with these new relations to be between the U.S. and China.

LIN PIAO AND MAO TSE-TUNG

Following the grounding of all planes in China, the cancellation of the annual mammoth Oct. 1 celebration of Communist victory, and the continued failure of any public appearance by the designated heir of Mao—Lin Piao (whose reincarnation as Mao's "closest comrade-in-arms" is part of the Constitution itself)—all we have left from the official Chinese press are a few cryptic notes about "plots," and now there will "always" be people who "fight plots."

Whatever it is that China will finally tell the world, one thing is sure: China cannot stand another such "victorious Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" as it took to remove from power that other "close comrade-in-arms," Liu Shao-chi. And yet nothing would be more correct than to conclude from all this, merely that Mao is a genius at miscalculating "dangerous comrades-in-arms," whom he nevertheless has a consuming passion to designate. It would be too easy a way out. It would tell us nothing at all about the objective situation in China and how the world saw "retained," and it would lead us into the subjective trap of viewing it all as a "mere" power struggle.

...A power struggle is never "true" as a power struggle. It always reflects the state of the economy, and policies as well as global aims even if not of the actual relations. Even if Lin had lost out in the power struggle "precisely because" he was concerned "only" with assuring his becoming "No. 1" when Mao dies, the greater truth would still be that such personal drives could emerge, because the Army was the force that assailed Mao's victory (not as much over "capitalist readers" as from the actual Left the Cultural Revolution unleashed); because the decisive force in getting workers to work hard, and hard was, again, the Army and hence, today, it was the Army that brought order out of chaos and power back to the leadership so that Chiao Chia-shih and his circle, foreign affairs, of global politics, not empty-handed.

...If the Party that controlled the guns switched violently from U.S. imperialism as "Enemy No. 1" to "less bad", that was also a surprise to the head of the Army. After all, what was the Cultural Revolution all about if it was not to limit the Chinese that RUSSIA, NOT THE U.S., was Enemy No. 1." Pud differenly, even if the fall of Lin Piao was not a result of any change in the line leading to China's entry into the UN and intensified friction with U.S. imperialism, even if it was "our power struggle, purely personal," its significance is not what did or did not, will or will not happen to the U.S., but what had happened to the relationship of the Cultural Revolution and the line of the U.S. (Continued on Page 8)

(1) And we do mean "The Thought of Mao Tse-tung," and not just his personality. From our very start of the Cultural Revolution we posed the question whether Mao was being "self-created" or "superimposed." (See "China's Self-Created Turmoil," News & Letters, October, 1967.)

(2) See "Mao and the New Mandate" by Edgar Snow (New Republic, April 10, 1959).

(3) "U.S. and Russia Enter Middle East Conflict" (China Letterst), So biased to the increase in "Mao's Thought" are the "left" scholars-scientists in China studies that one defended to me China giving sanctuary to the Blues of Al-Shahary on the ground that it was done "only for politics and not because there is a grain of anti-Semitism in Mao."
Ever since 1956 the Revolution in Hungary, on the one hand, and the "50,000 Flowers" campaign in China, on the other hand, forced Mao to face reality: the overwhelming truth that the revolutionary masses were moving away from Communism; that the Opposition in Communist states came, not so much from the right as from the left. As one who had been a revolutionary, immersed in "permanent revolution," and was now a Communist ruler, Mao searched for ways "to get there faster," with or without the proletariat. It wasn't too hard a thought, since he never had much confidence in the proletariat, though he had thought the peasants were revolutionaries. In any case, first came "The Great Leap Forward." But even from achieving "30 years in one day," the country, with the help of natural disasters, came to near-famine. Then, in the 1960's, with the birth of a Third World, came the Sino-Soviet conflict. Counting on "the new storm centers of the world" to help him make China the center, Mao worked for a new global axis (Peking-Djakarta-Francisco). Finally, came the "uninterrupted revolution" that gave an insidious image of revolutionism to Mao.

In actuality, however, the so-called Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was brought about by that year of crisis, testing and judgment.1966. That was the year that began in February with U.S. imperialism raining bombs on Hanoi thus making it, not Peking, the testing ground. The year ended in October with the collapse of the Hanoi-Peking axis. This time the pressures for a change in line came not only from the masses but also from the leadership; and, not only from other countries that stood with China in the Sino-Soviet conflict, but also from its own Political Committee that evidently had not excluded a united front with Russia, at least interlaced as helping Vietnam was France or China's cult of personality, but not the U.S. or Russia, remained Enemy No. 1. In spite of the initially chaotic world situation had to be "turned around again by the time Mao launched the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" it wasn't only Khru- shchev that was being attacked but also "Chinese Khru- shchev," Liu Shao-ch'i.


The final straw was added when the youth who had taken Mao at his word, worked, indeed, to pull down the "Red capitalists"—headed by Liu Piao and Chou En-Lai.2 It was then that Mao turned completely around and, with his "closest comrades-in-arms," struck out against the masses he now called the "ultra-left," He called a Congress to re-establish state power, military order, foreign realignment.

Put simply, once you move away from the masses; once you hit the jackpot, with Nixon taking the initiative to establish "a dialogue"; once the global vision is not world revolution, but world power—the road through the UN, leading to big power politics, breaks.

The shock is that not state-capitalists China calling itself Communist took that road. The shock is that the "Left"—and not only in the UN that dared not oppose China's H-bomb test on the very day "disarmament" was being discussed and China attacked Russia "from the left"—but the independent anti-war and revolution-

ary movements proceeded with their delusions about "revolutionary Marxism."

Whether it is full regional realignment or just markets (plus, of course, 1972 election), that Nixon is looking to, the high mountains on which one must stand: to watch the play of the tiger begins and ends—be Nixon, for the U.S., for Brezhnev—will tell. It will not be India-Pakistan, or Arab-Israel, or Rhodesia-Zambia that will be allowed to set the timing device, and certainly it will not be any national liberation movements. The super-powers have but one prerequisite: it is they, and not the masses, who must rule. Though the masses, however, do have the last word, it isn't any "timing device" that will be the victor. Time itself will be torn out of joint as the world knits itself up.

It is this we must stop now, must stop, to begin with, by turning away from the super-powers' ground. Otherwise, unless the distance and the action can possibly upset this existent world, whether it has the private capitalist form or the state-capitalist form calling itself Communist.

(2) See Whither China: Manifest of Sheng Wojen. (Excerpts published by News & Letters in Voices of Revolt from China.)
Letter exchange blasts Marxist slander

By Rayo Densayakaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom

EDITOR'S NOTE: For the second time, LE MONDE has failed to publish any answers to its scurrilous attack on MARXISM AND FREEDOM, which appeared in their issue of Sept. 2, 1971 in Paris. We print below an exchange of letters between LE MONDE's reviewer and Raya Densayakaya. Excerpts from the review and Densayakaya's first brief reply appeared in NEWS & LETTERS, October, 1971.

September 25, 1971

Cherie Madame,

I have reviewed your letter concerning my review of your book in Le Monde. It's impossible for me to develop in a few lines the criticism that I could make regarding your undertaking, and I hope that we will one day be able to talk about it really and clear up a number of these points. I will attempt only to enumerate some points of contention which are not only mine, but which are also shared by a number of my friends who have read your book.

1—Your intention is significant: to understand how Marxism, a theory of liberation, could give birth to repressive practices Stalinism and non-Stalinism. But your book makes use of all the anti-communist cliches and in no way analyzes the problems. You constantly speak of "communism's perpetual error," of the "terror of slavery," of the "most barbarous regime on earth," of "totalitarianism..." Is it the life that you would have? This is not an analysis.

2—The return to Marxism starting with the early texts is a myth. The texts of 1844 are without meaning unless considered within the ensemble of Marx's work.

3—Your historic analyses are often surprising: you ascribe facts which do not at all have the meaning that you give them; for example, the association of the intervention in Prague with the war in Vietnam, of the 1968 struggle in Hungary with the humanist result of the workers of East Berlin with American blacks.

4—Your analysis of the degeneration of Soviet Marxism is not radically different from the thesis of Burnham.

5—That you were attacked by the McCarthyites does not prove your Marxist orthodoxy.Folders, raising mail, you were also prey to these attacks, and he was an anti-Communist.

6—I would like to know your position on the Angela Davis question, for example: What do you think of her ideas?

7—I know little about your past and if you could send me some documentation on your work and your life, I would be happy to speak about it in the future in Le Monde.

8—Do not allow me to play games and ask you to be present, without as you say, is truly a non-faction.

In the hope of hearing from you soon, I send you my highest regards.

Dr. J. M. Palmer
Professor of Philosophy and Sociology

October 11, 1971

Dear Dr. Palmer:

Your letter of Sept. 25, 1971, has just reached me in Canada where I happen to be on lecture tour. I was glad to see you dropped any reference to the American roots of Marxism as if this were an invention of mine; also that you no longer refer to Lenin as if I had placed him in the same category as Stalin, Khrushchev and Mao. Now then, the questions you now pose:

First comes the serious matter of the transformation of Marxism, a philosophy of liberation, into its opposite, the theory and practice of state-capitalism calling itself Communism. My theory of state-capitalism was first developed in 1941, was the first study based on original Russian sources—the three Five Year Plans, 1928 to the outbreak of World War II. The study of this data takes up no less than 45 pages (p. 282-295) of Marxisme et Liberte, which preceded to prove the operation of the law of value in Russia, and else such horrendous new features as forced labor camps, all of which was being discussed as "socialism," where the law of value is supposed to be imperative. Furthermore, the life in forced labor camps, far from being what you call my cliches, is told in the words of the actual inmates during the springing in Vorba in July 1959. And, may I call your attention that the fate of this analysis is not different now," but, "Russia is More Than Ever Full of Revolutionaries" (p. 172).

CHAPTER 13, WHICH sets out the actuality and not just the jargon of Russian state-capitalism, does and with an expose also of Stalin's (not Marx's) revision of Marx's theory of value. This revision too I had been the first to translate into English as soon as it appeared in Russia in the Journal of the Marxists Union (under the banner of Marxism), which had not arrived in U.S. libraries. This debate over this startling revelation, which in the United States lasted for a whole year (1944 to 1945), reappeared on the Continent after World War II. (One of my articles, "Revue Internationale, 9 octobre 1945. Another and later examination of my position that appeared in French is "Bureaucratization et capitalisme d'Etat," in Arguments, no 12-13, Janvier-Fevrier 1945.)

Because the practice of state-capitalism is a great deal more painful than the theory, I stressed in the Preface: "Russian Communism rests on the misappropriation of capitalism—paying the worker the minimum, and extracting from him the maximum." (p. 32). Because this is central to my whole work, I proposed to prove this contention in the context of the book (Part Five). Because theory is not at all the abstraction it appears to be to many, and Marx himself did anticipate such a development if "the law of motion of capitals" went "the whole way," and because this affected even great revolutions who slipped off the fundamental ground of Marx's "abstract" analysis, I also dealt with the question in my analysis of crises developed by Marx in Vol. II of Capital. May I call your attention to the end of Chapter 8, which takes up Rosa Luxembourg's theory of accumulation of capital, and contrasts it to Marx's "(Apparenct and Reality," p. 155-156)"

SECONDLY, I AM most sorry to see that you believe the 1844 manuscripts to be "an idiot." This is your (Continued on Page 7)
privilege, of course. However, I did not leave the question of the Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts (Chapter 2 of Marxism and Liberty) in its formlessness by Marx in 1844, or to the Russian attacks on it in 1855, but carried through the Humanism of Marxism throughout the four volumes of Marx's Capital, to which I devote no less than four chapters. Thus, Part Three, "Marxism: Unity of Theory and Practice," lays heavy stress, not on the Humanism of 1844, but on "The Humanism and the Dialectic of Capital, Vol. 1 (1967-1982)." Again, it is impossible to displace theory from practice, and not just in Marx's day but in our own, when we deal with Marxism.

Therefore, what I ossifrice is the actual appearance on the historic stage of Marx's Humanism in the Hungarian Revolution, 1848. It has remained front center on that historic stage ever since. I was most pleased to have been one of only three Americans asked to participate in the international symposium, Szekler Hunyadi, edited by Eric Fromm. I regret that you see no relationship between the Russian counter-revolutionary interventions in East Europe, either in Hungary in 1849 or in Czechoslovakia in 1968, and the historic American imperialist actions in Vietnam. I doubt that those who have to live under Soviet totalitarianism in East Europe see no parallel in these two imperials. And it is a fact that the American masses—Blacks and youth mainly, but not so distant from the rank and file labor as is made to appear—who are fighting their government's savage imperialism against the Vietnamese people, do see a parallel.

NOR IS THIS parallel seen merely for "propaganda purposes," as in the movie letter from a Birmingham jail in 1892 by Martin Luther King, Jr., who draws a sharp parallel between U.S. racism and Nazism, on the one hand, and on the other hand, between the Hungarian revolutionaries and the Black revolutionaries. Last year, for example, when the Polish workers rose up in strikes and demonstrations against their condition of labor, we witnessed demonstrations in sympathy here.

In any case, luster as I am concerned, I do not believe in the Theory of the lesser evil. The one time that I participate in any actions with Communists is when the reactionary American government strikes out against revolutionaries here, especially Blacks. Thus, in the question that you raised about Angela Davis, I am of course part of the Free Angela Davis movement. This needs further explanation because I do think there is a misunderstanding in your conception of what my anti-Communism supposedly leads to. I fight the Communists, whom I consider state-capitalists, globalists. Many an American revolutionary, this in no way steps me from fighting American capitalism.

As you do notice, Herbert Marcuse, who introduced my work, disagrees with me sharply, particularly on the role of labor, and I disagree even more sharply with him. Yet he felt that my analysis of "the Marxist outline" was such an original contribution that someone in academia must introduce B. At the present moment, the C. P. is carrying on the most vicious campaign against him, but this has not stopped him from working for the freedom of his most important oratorics. Angela Davis, in a word, neither of us consider either that we should hide our differences, or that our differences should keep us from working together against capitalism.

YOU WILL PARDON me if I do not go into still another discussion of Bushman. I would like to believe you when you say, "I do not dream of associating you with the present-day Bushman." Why then have you drawn this non-fascist into our discussion, when he nowhere appears in my book, and I am darn sure I nowhere appear in his? My theory of state-capitalism, which was never separated from its sensitive, workers' revolutions, was never his, and his theory of managerial society, which he had considered "the new anarchism," was never mine. Wasn't it bad enough that I had to explain my "pact" (which has never been revolutionary) for Le Monde? Why should I have to sink down to Bushman's ground of argumentation? Can't you see that Le Monde does publish my public analyses? Yes, I would like some day to meet and discuss more with you in person, but you must realize that I have suffered through many slanders and relegation to the status of unperson, both in Russia and the United States, ever since I became Leon Trotsky's secretary at the height of the most infamous Moscow Frame-Up Trials in 1937. I trust, therefore, that our dialogue can continue on the ground of my own work rather than on the ground of Other.

Yours sincerely,

Raya Dunayevskaya
Two forgotten pages of Ralph Bunche's life story

establishing the National Negro Congress to try to unite workers and tenant farmers, domestics and intellectuals, racial organizations and unions and churches and radicals; in a word, to shake up the system that had drenched King Cotton but not King Capital.

In the Spring of 1935, when Bunche, as Chairman of the Division of Social Sciences at Howard University, had conceived a form of a mass organization to organize the urban North—the National Negro Congress, the Socialists had organized the Southern Tenant Farmers Union. The terror campaign, not excluding outright murder of organizers, with which the Bourbon South had met the organizing drive, led to the calling of a cotton growers strike in 1936. The landlords and their "law and order" deputy sheriffs—those actually consisted of practicing outright police (1)—brought the destitute living conditions there to the breaking point, as the landlords also drove sharecroppers off the land.

There are few enough books on that hard page of history, and none at all on Ralph J. Bunche’s role. Yet he had organized one of the most effective interracial committees in Washington, D.C., in all the sharecroppers. And he himself was never too tired to speak in still one more out-of-the-way church or civic or radical group to raise funds to help the sharecroppers, to give—money to the man who had to abandon the land and come to the nation's capital that was, except for the street cars, Jim Crow.

Along with John P. Davis of the Joint Committee on National Recovery and A. Philip Randolph, President of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, the Sponsor Organizing Committee for the National Negro Congress received support also from Community, Socialists, and many others. The Congress was set to a fast start when it convened in Chicago in 1936. No less than 69 delegates, representing 150 organizations—from churches to farm

organizations, from women's groups to trades unions, from professional groups to political groups and parties—were present. Indeed, out of them all were born many of the organizing committees that were to become the CIO.

Clearly, Professor Bunche wasn't sitting in any ivory tower. Clearly, this intellectual didn't keep himself separated from the great masses in motion. Black and white. And just as clearly, though no doubt surprised to the Communists, he wasn't under any illusions as to why the Communists were in it at the moment, and how quickly the "iron" fence Moscow could change. Changes it did, with the outbreak of World War II. The demise of the National Negro Congress began now.

The TRANSITION POINT

Along with activity in mass organizations came philosophic development. Ralph Bunche became critical not only of the economic, political and social status of the Negro, but of all existing Negro organizations that strove to ameliorate this condition. He called them "philosophic and programming papas." He was critical likewise of all Negro leaders who, he said "think and act entirely in a black groove." In his pamphlet, A World View of Race, he even comes up with a solution to the Negro problem:

"The Negro must develop, therefore, a consciousness of class interest and purpose and must strive for an alliance with the white working class in a common struggle for economic and political equality and justice."

This high point of his self-development as social

1) The infamous Sheriff Peacher was the only one convicted, but by no means the only one who practiced it. The more excruciating history to follow is the duration and ingenuity of revolt. See Howard Kester's Revolt Among Sharecroppers; also The South in Progress by Katharine Kemple, Stuart Jamieson, Labor Unrest in American Agriculture.
radicalism of Negro intellectuals exemplified by the
situation from Mr. Bunche, ran easily come to the
issue with the type of liberal but skeptical fasceuse
(no setting) opinion so prevalent among white social
scientists, writing on the Negro problem . . . Since
neither party is very active in trying to induce or
prevent an economic revolution, it does not make
much difference if the Negro radicals look forward
to an economic revolution and the white sociologists
do not." (Page 1326, footnote 13.)

THE UN AND THE CONGO

It was the beginning of the end of the revolutionary
road for Ralph Johnson Bunche. It wasn't that he had
ever become an Uncle Tom, but Bunche turned to no one,
not the intellectuals, while as well as blacks (and after
Hill's attack on Russia, spouted on by Communist)
World War II looked like the "democratic" answer to
Nazism. (For that matter, the greatest belt-borne trans-
formation into opposite was the CHI's voicing with capi-
talism in the transformation of the American produc-
tion process into the world armaments center, misnamed
"arsenal of democracy.") Ralph Bunche plunged into
the preliminary work for the U.N. and then became
sound in command in the U.N. Total self-deception came
with becoming the architect of the Middle East. As he
was to express it, "the single most satisfying week I've
ever done . . . for the first time we have found a way
to use military men for peace instead of war."

Then came the Congo. As if in answer to
Premier Patrice Lumumba's request for aid in keeping
the rich Katanga province from seceding from the newly-
born Congo Republic, UN troops, misnamed "peace-kept-
ing missions" and branded by Bunche, were dispatched
to the Congo. Rooted in this UN intervention was the
turn (act of U.N. as "collegial" imperialist as well as
the new form of struggle between the two nuclear titans
—the United States and Russia. This was not just the
beginning of the end of Bunche as "revolutionary"; it
was the end of Bunche as Black as man, as "world
view of race". All that remained was total self-deception.

—February 13, 1972
Editorial Article

Nixon-Mao extravaganza: new peaceful co-existence — with whom? for what?

by Raya Dunayevskaya

National Chairperson, News & Letters Committees

Now that the Mao-Nixon-Chou-Kissinger TV spectacular is over, and Nixon's old "Nationalism" slogans are being sung to the same old tune, it is about time we came to an understanding of the key point; it is time to assess, not the non-existent victory-defeat scoreboard, but the truly new direction in global power-politics.

Nothing sheds more light on how alike the raw Nixon is to the old than the 180-degree turn from TV saturation on the wonder of ancient China and the new Nixon through that historic week (Feb. 21-28) that was supposed to have "changed the world"; to Nixon's total silence presently on all questions except his reactionary position against bombing. In a week, when it comes to the home front, the Black home front, Nixon, new and old, is all too anxious to roll the clock of history back, all the way back, to pre-1964 U.S. Supreme Court racist policies on "segregation."

HERE AND OVER THERE

Nothing remains the same than change when change is initiated by rulers, be they American or Chinese. All one has to do to see the affinity of those two opposites is to look at them at home. Or, if you wish, as they look at home via satellites. Compare Mao welcoming Nixon into his study while hundreds of thousands of Chinese with Tent cards, and box, show the streets are clear of streets for visitors from the land of "Enemy No. 1." Now place at Nixon, table-hopping at the luxuriously red-carpeted "Communist" Palace, while unemployed and welfare lines grow ever bigger as his aides are busy working out ways of controlling wages, strikes, and doing nothing at all about the slummers and deaths in West Virginia mines, and so on.

This doesn't mean that the Mao-Nixon Communique didn't contain some startling reversals in global politics. But they are all within the context of national Big Power politics. Put differently, despite the overlying truth about those two "indecipherables," Mao and Nixon, nothing on the world scene will ever be quite the same.

This is so, not because there are any "achievements," let alone "victories," for Washington to chalk up, for internal or external consumption. It is so because, in this case, the form of this TV spectacular transmitted live via satellites to all foreign chancelleries, had the desired global impact as against the murky content and foreign-language language in the Communique. And, though it was not "the week that changed the world," the TV extravaganzas did, in a flash, illustrated the terrifying possibility that if those two men willed it, they could, in fact, make it so.

We must, therefore, turn away from the strange admixture of large pleasure with small terror, and turn instead to the Communique's word Communique conceals more than it reveals. But since Mao-Nixon-Chou-Kissinger are not adepts in_adherents to torture language to state untruths as truths, it is not too difficult to get to the root of the matter. Take the question of Taiwan. Supposedly this is where Chou gained most and Nixon lost most. The truth is that neither gave anything that was not theirs to give—and take—and not even that which was theirs to give.

Thus, the 6,000 army men there now were not in Taiwan when the infamous Dulles 1954 Pact was initiated. Except for a few hundred, they were first put there as the war was escalating in the Laos war. Now that the cold-war warrior Nixon has become the exponent of "peaceful co-existence"; now that the quoter of Mao's poem—"Ten thousand years are too long. Sine a day, sin the hour"—asks that "the moment" be seized; and now that this loud-mouth talker of "a generation of peace" in place of "entrenchment of Communism" has become adept in transforming "the long march" to his nuclear jet travel, wasn't it time at least to set a date for that small gesture No. 1?

The declaration of but one China notwithstanding, the promise of withdrawing "all U.S. forces from Taiwan" is hedged with nothing more specific than "objectives," while the time factor is put off into the indefinite as "ultimate." And as if the Communique wasn't clear enough on that point, our modern Morenstein, Kissinger, makes it clear in his briefing of the press, that the Nixon Administration means to take the slow boat to Taiwan in order to have "leverage," as China's relations with the U.S. move from words to action.

It isn't that Chou Hsiao was browbeaten by the likes of Nixon any more than it was a matter of Nixon coming to China "to surrender Taiwan." Rather, it is a case of both national powers living reality; that is to say, acknowledging that since Taiwan is not an immediate issue while global realignment is, let's put Taiwan in the deep freeze so that the plunge to "normalization" of our Big Power relations proceeds with dispatch.

In any case, wasn't Chiang Kaishek who was "betrayed?" It was Vietnam. And not the Thieu gang in South Vietnam, but the Vietcong and the true besieged forces, that was being violated daily with U.S. genocidal saturation bombing while also proceeded, undisturbed, to prepare for the big meeting with Nixon.

It is true that one of the original reasons for Nixon's decision to go to Peking was to get Mao to take him off the Vietnam blacklist. In 1969 it had a certain priority since it was all too clear that not only could Nixon not and the second Redchina was, not only, at home, the anti-Vietnam movement had reached its most massive and intense high point that truly shook the country to its foundation after the Kent massacre.

But, though Mao was willing to take Nixon off that not, the outcry of North Vietnam was so unequalled that Mao was compelled to deny he ever had made a proposal for a "summit" conference to decide the Vietnam war. By 1972 when the internal cycle within China led to the removal of Lin Piao, Mao's designated Constitutional "closest confidant-in-arms and successor" (my emphases) it was clear to Nixon and Men alike that, if they were to take the plunge into unmeditated areas of world realignment, they better let nothing, absolutely nothing, stand in the way of their projected glibốige.

The Communique tries to cover up affinity to U.S. imperialism and betrayal of "nationalist ally" by having the U.S. and China each reaffirm "its own position" behind respective allies. The only trouble is that such "opposite" positions stand in the way of their projected glibốige. 

6879

APRIL, 1972
flows from China's cautious words about "self-determination," "national liberation," "people's revolution." But this is no strike at all.

Still, what possible "unifying force" could bring those opposing, wily U.S. and India's China, togeth-
er—at the expense of Indo-China, at the sacrifice of the leaders of its "Cultural Revolution," to the disintegration of the revolutionaries who had followed him in proclaiming this to be the epoch of "world revolution" against the "reactionary" Russian "socialist" "peaceful coexistence."

Let's take another look at that Communist and see our time whether we can discern what it doesn't say in what it does say.

BANGLADESH OR RUSSIA?

The one point in the separate states that states the same thing is agreed with in the "United Nations Sec-
urity Council Resolution of Dec. 21, 1971, calling for
the cease fire between India and Pakistan, and the with-
drawal of all military forces within their own terri-
tory."

Neither has said anything about the new state of Bangladesh which neither has recognized. But now that they admit to speaking with one voice on "Inter-
ternational relations," the two stated, "... neither should seek hegemony in the Asia-Pacitic region and each is opposed to the efforts by any other country or group of countries to establish such hegemony..." (my emphasis.)

And, having declared their opposition to "any other country" seeking "hegemony," China and the U. S. moved further in union. Both sides are of the view that "it would be against the interests of the peoples of the world for any major country to collude with an-
other country... Since they are the two countries openly in collision at the moment, while the country that has established itself on the birthplace of Bangladesh is Russia, it is not too hard to guess the unnamed country the U.S.-China declaration had in mind. How remin-
descent of the days when the Sino-Soviet conflict broke out in 1960—when Russia constantly would name "Al-
bania" when it meant China, and would designate "Yugoslavia" when it meant Russia! Presently all the talk of Pakistan and India is, in fact, talk about Bangla-
desh and Russia.

In China's part of the statement, Chou En-lai added to China's adherence to the U.N. Resolution of yesterday, "the Indian-Pakistan question," that, furthermore, China supports Pakistan's government... That was always so, whether that government was run by General Bhutto or by General Zia. It published the gen-
cidal war against the East Pakistani liberation move-
ment. Not that All-India heads West Pakistan, China has transformed its left into an outright threat. It has never varied in its designation of Russia as the "bogy" of India, and Bangladesh as its "puppet." (See "Can There be War Between Russia and China?")

In July 1971, when Russia signaled that it was prepared to back Bangladesh against India, the U.S. was shocked. The Indian Prime Minister told the U.S. Information Agency that the Russians would not back Pakistan. The U.S. was left to fend for itself alone.

Thus, to make his "peaceful co-existence" work, Nixon had to close the doors to all other alliances if they can get put of the way of the non-intervention zones. Take what the Communists didn't say about the Cold War. After all, it is the...
new power there, and enough not only to influence Middle East events, but to challenge U.S. imperialism and perhaps kick-off World War III. So, Russia has only to beckon. And beckon it did, and, however, as mere supplicant.

Quite the contrary. Ever since the Nixon trip was first projected, Russia was busy not only on the sub-
current, but also directly with Japan—which is too big a power for the U.S. to think for one moment that they could throw it aside like Taiwan. Kissinger's "philoso-
phic" talk about "history's imperatives"—which, for the press, he equated with the reversal of policy regard-
ing China—exposed its totally contradictory character in the manner in which Japan was treated.

First and most important, not only was the subject treated entirely separately by China and the U.S.—with

neither giving an inch—but Marshall Gronem was at once disappointed to spell out the Communist's statement as to how "to develop the existing close bonds." The old-
now Nixon wasn't about to forget the "Nixon Doctrine," which cleared the way for Japan to become the sup-
power in the Asia-Pacific area. In any case, being the big industrial power—the third in the whole world—

Japan was playing its own imperialist game. Having been forced to soften its full competitive threat to the U.S. in international trade, it proceeded, at one and

45° same time, to disregard U.S. restrictions against North Vietnam by establishing relations with it and to talk

with Russia about participating in the building of Siberia facing China!

Nixon was deuding himself that U.S. in 1971, can

play in Asia what his predecessors played in Europe in World War II—aligning with defeated or near-defeated

powers to come out holier the decisive hand—and establish a "new order in the Pacific," he most cer-

tainly has not the slightest idea of "history's imperative-

fives" even in inter-imperial rivalry, much less as to what faces him in the Pacific.

Some buzzing could be heard even at the staged

scheme for his return to Washington and his "patri-

otism" appeal to the unhinging old Cabal Lobby. That

was the slightest indication of what the election year of 1972 holds in store for the man who dupes himself

to be both a Marco Polo and the anticipator of racist

hysteria against school kids by offering to wipewash that "damned spot" with "quality education."

THE TEST IS HERE

"Out, damned spot! Out, I say!... What, will they hands never be clean?... Here's the smell of the blood still

all the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand."—Lady Macbeth

Mao may prefer Nixon as President, but the decision

will not be made in China, but in the U.S.; 1972 is the

year of testing. Whatever it is Nixon brought home from

his sojourn in Peking—and the one historic thing, rela-
tionship with China, cannot ever be an old-Nixon-light

again—the totality of the crisis here has not shifted.

The unemployment has become a permanent feature of

automated decadent capitalism and with it, "welfare." The whole U.S. economy, in fact, though it remains the

"mightiest," has sunk to second place even at the level of

technology, i.e., productivity, for the good and sub-

stantial and visible reason, that labor reform to produce
cardly without question as profit and corruption
govern both industry and the government.

And, regarding all these, for there we have the

unending, relentless, and revolutionary Black force, in

the racist counter-revolutionary U.S. Government and

Nixon is under the illusion that he has achieved "mass

support" because liberals, too, have joined the hysteria

against having

The one thing he has forgotten, as had Goldwater

before him, will defeat him. It is the class question.

Even though a section of the working class is as racist

as the middle class, the truth is that, on the labor

question, they are turned against Goldwater—and will

against Nixon—that he did lose the election. Further-

more, Nixon is in the same position as Johnson was

when, having won against Goldwater, he thought he

could continue with the Vietnam War. Mao may allow

Nixon to delude himself by making it appear that

"global" issues outweigh any "small war" issue, but not

the Vietnamese who have fought Imperialism, China

included, the centuries. And neither will the anti-Vietnam

war movement, the youth especially.

The very fact that even the Black Models here

cannot stomach Nixon, and are at this very moment

trying to see whether they can organize a Black move-

ment, shows the direction, the true historic Imperative

of a truly independent mass force—abor-Black-youths,

Women's Liberation—that will strike out, first and foremost

against the capitalist enemy at home, and refuse to

yield to state-capitalist forces that dare call themselves

"Communist." There can be no freedom when one chooses

a "cleaner evil." It is only the zero way to link with the

"greater evil." The final and only answer will rest with

masses who will strike out for so deep a unity of

philosophy and revolution as to make freedom the reality.
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Women's Liberation and the search for philosophy

by Raya Dunayevskaya
National Chairman, News & Letters Committees

NO ONE KNOWS when the revolution will occur. It may be spontaneous. Nobody knows what will spark it. That is not the question. The question we are discussing is: what is the content of the new society? When we are not grounded in philosophy, the article was never written on what Marx wrote on his theory of historical materialism. That is always going on, factually, of course, which would be simple to prove even chronologically. But the most important error is not the factual one, but the methodology involved. Marx's historical materialism demonstrated that exploitation of labor by capital is rooted not only in the division between mental and manual labor, but in the relationship of man to woman. And Marx showed that all history was movement. History is not "past." It is present, too. All history is the history of class struggle.

Women's Liberation and the search for philosophy

by Raya Dunayevskaya
National Chairman, News & Letters Committees

This is why Lenin kept talking about the slavery of women; and why it was important for Black women not always to have none while standing over their shoulders. This independence is, however, not for separation, but to be able to develop in another stage. The winning class must be a return to philosophy to develop positions in your own organization. This self-satisfaction and "taking back our hands" is being done to free everyone, not to make the same mistakes as men.
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up Hegel, Marx, and Lenin. One of the most important
parts for us here is the section that deals with how Marx
criticized Hegel and at the same time broke with the
whole concept of what is theory. This is where history
as process comes in. Part II deals with Alternatives:
Trotsky, Mao, and Sartre. And Part III is "New Passions
and Forces", which deals with the blacks, youth and
women.

We have been able to show why the Black dimension
and why the youth are these new passions and new
forces, because, in fact, the blacks throughout American
history, and specifically since the Montgomery Bus Boyc
out, as well as the blacks in Africa, had raised ques
tions of deep philosophical import, whether Robert
Moses or education or Papon on the whole African revo
ation. The same reason—that is, concrete questions that
were raised—enabled us to show this on the part of the
Youth, as well, whether it was Stalin on alienation, or
the French Revolt in May, 1968, where the new forms of
students-workers committees were established. In the case
of the Women, we have not succeeded in showing quite
that many new voices. What we do know is that self-
development means that you will gain a new dimension
in yourselves, will feel a totally in the new process you
are becoming, as you give expression to what you are
feeling and thinking. The proof of Marxist-Humanism will
be in your own self-development.

The floor was opened for discussion to women only
for this first session. Raya was asked to discuss the dis
tinction between philosophy and theory, and explained
that a new philosophy appears only very rarely in
history... The important point is that we are all living
in the period of Marx's philosophy. He captured a whole
age, and while his philosophy was based on the mastery
of years and years of human activity, past and present,
it contains the germ for the future. Theory means taking
a part of the philosophy and developing it for your par
ticular period. There are divisions in theory. You can
ticipate, but only "in general", not the particular. The
important period is when you are able to single out the
new category, for your age.

Raya spoke of the development of the state-capital-
ism theory which was analyzed in 1941, but for which
the humanism dimension was not re-established until 1947.
Every new stage of capitalism comes only when a new
stage of objectivity has been reached. That theory means
recognizing the movement that was present in the phi
losophy, but not real yet. What it means is that when a
new force arises, you can catch it if you are rooted in
the philosophy.

A 10-year-old who was present asked the last quest
ion in this first session by posting: What kind of free
dom does Women's Liberation want?

The afternoon session took up the organizational
questions flowing from the theoretical groundwork, and
posed some of the concrete tasks of the HTL—Women's
Liberation Committee specifically.
Two Worlds

Nixon's global politicking: Phase II

BY RAYA DINAEVSKAYA,
Chairwoman, News & Letters Committees

As Commander-in-Chief, Nixon had, on May 8, announced that he had ordered the mining of Haiphong, an act of war even if LBJ had dared to commit. After 14 days of glorious watching the bloody consequences of this unprecedented step—combined with accurate laser-bombing of railways, and indescribable civilian destruction—deep in the heartland of a country we have never declared war against—the President embarked upon still another "journey for peace": the trip to Moscow.

Nixon had pulled off all very real reassurances from Brezhnev that, no matter what Nixon did to destroy Vietnam, Russia would not try to stop him, and signed a SALT pact. Followed by the victory of his second amendment, Nixon staged still another spectacular, though Moscow was supposed to be all "substance," and not just "truth." Having flown from Russia to Iran, and from Iran to Poland, and from Poland directly to Andrews Air Force base, Air Force One landed on cue, Nixon transferred to the presidential helicopter which powered directly to the Capitol Hill steps, where all TV cameras awaited to record him entering Congress in a standing ovation.

BARNUM & BAILEY, AND BREZHEV, TOO

Barnum & Bailey couldn't have put on a greater show, not after the recent Peking extravaganza, but then they didn't have the power of the presidency. And any one who didn't still have thought it impossible to overthrow "the sick that changed the world." was now asked to look at the real super-powers, the "deuce" between the superabundant fools, "a new way in relationships."

It is true that Nixon, too, had met with Nixon as he had formed his plan. But Brezhnev managed to satisfy his audience. In addition to the language he used in his speech, Brezhnev and Nixon issued "A Declaration of Principles." The document was signed by more than 100 representatives from cultural and economic relations and limitations of nuclear arms in which we will return later, but is listed in the following "Declaration of Principles" but, in truth, is one and only one "first principle," from which all others flow and to which they all refer. That first one states that the U.S. and Vietnam will proceed from the common determination that in nuclear age there is no alternative to fashioning mutual relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence."

BETRAYAL BY ANY OTHER NAME

The single most striking speech in Nixon's report of that summit was that of the U.S. President's public relations, but he is known in the peace, outside the nuclear terror. The root of this sentence was an understanding of the mining of Haiphong, and especially SALT, would be the road to peace.

Nixon, keen of all the Vietnamese, had been Nixon was purpling his ears, could have been surprised by that silvery note. What a child must have run down the rails of the Vietnamese revolution, these who are still alive after a quarter of a century of fighting for their national independence, as they read in this unprecedented 'Declaration of Principles' about 'peaceful coexistence' just when their land was being devastated and their people decimated by the mightiest nuclear-armed imperialism in the world. And to hear this from a 'fraternal ally' who was saying them that its relations with the U.S. was all for purposes of 'peaceful coexistence' that was stop- ping a nuclear holocaust. Betrayal by any other name is as hard to bear—and smell as badly, if not high in heaven, then in the dead depth of hell. It is time to turn to that never-never land of promised peace called strategic arms limitations treaty which, as one of the many brainwashed Reporters put it, will make us all "sleep more peacefully than we did when we left with President Nixon for Moscow."

THE HOOPLA OF SALT

Once Nixon began his "report" on the Moscow summ- mit, there was no need to his battery of Congress that he had been here and treating as an adversary. The reason was that SALT cannot become law until Congress approves it. He isn't concerned with the extreme right that thinks he "gave away" too much. He's been given away nothing. He's been wise to appear as the "son of peace," and he never tire of his phone claim to having nothing short of "a generation of peace."

Actually the strategic arms limitation treaty had been ready long before he put to Moscow for the superpower atmosphere. Moreover, though the economic crisis in each country is so great that both the U.S. and Russia could like to find a way of shortening some of the fantastic costs of nuclear buildup, neither trusts the other to actually undertake any serious disarmament. The handout forecasts for two reasons. One is that since each has enough to destroy the world ten times over, none looks like that looks, like an end to buildup. The second is that it is important to try to create Mikhail, as if this were the chance to permert the choreography of all for welfare at home. No one is, it is perfectly clear that in nuclear de- means there is a peaceful co-existence. All that even the rulers claim to have, will have to serve at the utmost level. Is it true that the level reached is "peaceful?"

For example, there is no limit either to the number of warheads or the power of each that is still in the more "military." Here the U.S. has a great advantage since both the power and the number of warheads—MIRV— is far superior to what the Russians have. Also, not a word was said either of the 500 U.S. soldiers landing in Europe. In Europe, there is no such limit, and there are even more in that are frozen at their present levels. Besides, the Russians are trying to develop MIRV since that is not among the forbidden items.

Worst of all, is the rush in this country to build up all sorts of new "defenses." Should any be on the balance to think about new "defenses" or even a just a balance of defense budget, then all they have to do is listen to what the Russians have. Besides, the budget defense, an additional $2.2 billion is being asked to build the new submarines. Especially the U.S. is launching a program for new submarines where the Russians are supposed to be the superior. Thirdly— as if that is simplified—are there new long-range sub- marine missiles launch projects (SLBMs) for which the military is planning to ask another $1 billion!
It is the Russians who are trying to lead it is the American people.

TRADE AND VIETNAM

Without knowing who our friends are, the Americans are still fighting in Vietnam. Just as in the 1930s and 1940s, America is making a deal of the Chinese. The Chinese are making a deal of the Russian. In 1919, in the Great Depression, the United States was fighting in China. This is their strategy. And that is why they are still fighting in Vietnam. They want to get the Chinese to fight for them.

The economic crisis, the desire to industrialize Siberia (in which Japanese technology is already involved), the fear that the U.S. might conclude a separate agreement with China, all led to leaving all steps out in going through with summit, no matter what. And actually it wasn't SALT, but trade that Russia was after, most of all. For that they were willing to give much—but Vietnam was not there to give.

Thus, Nixon came, saw, but didn't conquer. He wanted more than a principled betrayal of Vietnam.

He wanted Vietnam to capitulate as if it were Russia's to give. Nixon's reaction to losing trade to that "satellite" (naturally not openly acknowledged) very nearly turned the Moscow summit into a greater misadventure as the Chinese. Russia, no more than China, can extract from Vietnam what the Vietnamese revolutionaries are determined to decide for themselves—their own destiny in their own hands, and for that right they have earned the solidarity of the masses of the world.

No doubt, though the only thing in trade agreed upon was to establish a commission to look into the matter. Some sort of trade agreement will be initiated in July which will be nearer to election time. Nixon depends heavily on his "great achievements" in Russia to help him get elected, but the point is why wasn't a trade agreement signed in Moscow since the U.S., capitalists likewise want it badly for their economy? Ah, there is the rub: there is where Nixon had to become state-capitalist.

NIXON AS STATE-CAPITALIST

What Nixon calls "the new age of relationships" is by no means limited to global politics. It starts and remains at home, too. Ever since 1970, he has been overshadowed by the stability of the Nixon-Russia invasion of Cambodia which brought about the socialist anti-Vietnamese war and the end of youth, through the near-collapse of the dollar on the world market and the unprecedented trade deficit. In October, inflation and unemployment—a war in which the Vietnam War was fought—embarked on shock treatment for all. Like rats leaving a sinking ship the Nixon Administration announced the highly anticipated "new order" in world markets system," and initiated a "new" state order. From the New Economic Policy focused on increasing consumption in the economy, first as a freeze on wages and prices, but not profits, then on control of wages, but again not on profits. That was supposed to bring jobs thousands upon thousands of jobs. With capital accumulation limited by the state, but expanded investment left in private capital. Having become a state-capitalist worldview, the private enterprises think all problems solved—all that is enough. Two men of the time seemed enough. Here it is a year later, and the profits have skyrocketed, but the unemployment has remained as steady as a rock. The private capitalists know exactly what is at stake in labor productivity and man-hours are as greedy only their uncontrollable costs can be, not only intermoderated anymore, but failed to hire any new labor.

Instead of thousands of new jobs, labor was speeded up instead of opening up capital. Instead of increased wages, it was spent up. Instead of new speeches for retaining vets or for youth, especially black youth, the U.S. remains a series of closed corporations. They are doing almost nothing to stop inflation—and when the government keeps jacking up its non-convertible currency (in war to devalue currency) the trade deficit, and the ever-expanding budget.

The Stabilization Act of 1970 stabilized nothing but profits. The Productivity Commission got its whip-labor has never been more strangled in wages and speeded-up in production. And now the Government has its face Congress with showing a whopping $25 billion deficit for 1972, a rise in bureaucratic supporter to read wages and prices but not the rising government debt.

Nixon is ready to start talking about balancing unemployment down to an "acceptable level" and by now it is called "productivity" at the end of inflation—but on that he is demanding that his Capital help him influence votes of all his victories. Hence, he withheld trade agreements with the Russians, because he is holding out the prospect of both Russian capitalism—just as if it is. There will be no longer be separation of economics from politics—which is precisely what state-capitalism is.

On the other hand, it all ends where it always has with capitalism, private or state, with capital-labor relationship. For unless that is mollified, the restless black dimension—nothing, absolutely nothing, will work.

THE PROBLEM IS HERE

The answer in Vietnam is exposing the Big Lie about "winding down the war" even as it relates to bringing "the American boys back home." The latest transfer of GIs from Vietnam to Vietnam hardly wins them home or assures their not dying just because the troops and murderous flights originate at Thailand rather than at South Vietnamese bases. Not only does the unemployment refuse to go away, but, as it stands, even "average" 6% unemployment, unemployment among veterans in 8%, and among the rats in the age group 20-24 it is 10.4. And it is twice as high among blacks.

As for the inflation, whenever inflation is supposed to go away with the Phite II price freeze, it keeps getting up along with the profits above and the restlessness of the masses below. In a word, what Nixon has returned to is a country full of crises, heightened by the white racism he has helped bring to a white hand from Wallace to his Snowcone Court. Now that he has succeeded also in getting Congress to roll back the clock of history by legislating anti-busing to school education, he must face the black outcry which wants not only to bring him down, but to change the whole system.

In a word, "the new internationalism" he is supposed to have established in Vietnam, has brought about peace neither directed nor at home. At least here where he will be compelled to come is not "peaceful coexistence" but the eye of the storm.
The Vietnam War and Global Summary

The carnage Nixon has ordered in Vietnam, in the South as well as the North, has resulted in the kind of "mistake" only a mad nuclear world can visit on the innocents—sapping children, his surrealistic panting of utterly banalized horrors could have matched the unspeakable human tragedy as mothers and fathers were running with their naked burned children in their arms.

At the very moment when, thereby, we were witnessing the transformation of My Lai into a veritable "way of life", the "paternalistic" American way of life, the mediocrity who had ordered ersatzes bombing displayed the further unspeakable hypocrisy by declaring his flying about the world with a hood full of blueprints for global realignment, a foundation for nothing short of a "generation of peace"! A press that can report such absolute opposite as if there were a grain of truth in the forked tongue talk of peace, and that the stridency in Vietnam is only one more example—and not an uncommon one—that in the spirit, it is, actually, offering proof that we have, instead, reached the end of "civilization"! And when such a President can be welcomed both in Peking and Moscow, the one-world rottenness smells to high heaven.

AN END must be put to this noose-creeping barbarism. The attempt to close all doors to reunification and call the N.S Exit sign "peaceful co-existence" cannot change the stark truth: Betrayal by any other name still equals counter-revolution. .

The "Ngo Question" has ever been the touchstone of American civilization that exposed the hollowness of its democracy—from the very moment of its birth, with the Declaration of Independence that rested on black slavery, down to the latest Nixon moves to turn the clock of history back on even so elementary a question as education. What is now in the state-capitalist age is that Nixon, having found in racism a way to break up the total opposition of the working class against his "New Economic Policy", is aiming to take control of the very mode of life of all.

THE NEO-FASCIST aspects surfaced with Wallace, whose demagoguery created a "mass base" for racism...

Whether or not Wallace can continue now that he is physically incapacitated to be the leader of the racist counter-revolution; whether or not racism will help elect Nixon; and whether or not the liberals can "recreate" it into a "liberal" base, the point is that racism, having always been the Great Divide, has, with state-capitalism, become Nixon’s "unique contribution". Neo-fascism surely has a new face, and Nixon has made it as respectable as "ovine" Atomic Hunter has made bigfoot the "in" thing.

We would forget at our peril that Nixon wasn’t the only form of fascism nor quelling the only form of collaborationism; that it was ingrained in "Western civilization" before France. Just how ingrained it was can be seen in the film, "The Sorrow and the Pity" (which is still forbidden in France). Most important of all, is in our day appearing in all sorts of new "little ways" like anti-hating. When Nixon rolls the clock of history backward on "education", we must not forget that this question relates not alone to the 1966 Supreme Court decision, but all the way back to the period of the post-Civil War President Johnson who first violated the victory of the Civil War. Nixon’s brand of state-capitalism is not only inseparable from his Pax Americana globalism, but also from the neo-fascist elements in Wallaceism, armed with state-power.

The Almost-Revolution and the Almost-Dialectic

...By the time of the almost-revolution in France, May 1968, the New Left seemed to learn from it that theory cannot after all be left to be picked up "en route". So overpowering, however, was the New Left’s illusions about Marx’s so-called Cultural Revolution, that none of them went to work out a new relation of theory to practice, the dialectic of thought, rooted in the new appreservative methods. Instead, the dialectic of revolution itself was reduced, at best, to "strategy" as if that were the equivalent of Marx’s philosophy of liberation, and, most often to "tactics" as if it had been merely a question of which corner to turn in to reach the battlefront, to erect "the barricades". The almost-dialectic, like the almost-revolution, left thought in as unfulfilled a state as were the aborted revolutions. Thus, the shock waves set off in 1971 by Mac’s invitation to Nixon failed to disturb even so theoretical a Commencement Breakaway as Italy’s FI Manifesto. Instead, it maintained that "because" we "are in the West" we had "made the revolution", we "forced" that "world revolutionary MOV" to embark on the "labyrinth"... .

If we are not to continue with endless almost-revolutions that only allow the counter-revolution to succeed, we must put an end both to the empiricism and the degradation of dialectics to "culture". If ever the intellectuals wished a serious revolutionary role, one that is not elitist, but indispensable because without the philosophy of liberation the revolution itself is abstracted, this is the time for uniting with the proletariat, for self-definition, for starting where the workers are...

The advantages we do have are that in an anti-Vietnam war movement, there is a continuous Black mass revolt, both in the factories and out, and that among intellectuals, too, there is a hunger for philosophy so that even the questioning "what is my role?" has been raised not as an elitist, vanguard party to lead, sense, but as a question of how to talk with labor.

There is very little time in a nuclear world, but we do have a little time provided we hurry, provided we do not daily-daily provide we under no circumstances whatever allow any division to creep in between philosophy and revolution. There can be no successful social revolution without a philosophy of liberation, a Marxist-Marxist perspective.
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Lord Nixon and state—capitalist crisis

No, Japan is not a "pentagonal" power in a non-existent pentagonal nuclear world.

FOR THAT MATTER, take a true nuclear titan which certainly is challenging the U.S. the world around —Russia. We have heard a great deal as to how "superior" Russia is to the U.S. in some fields, how it is the only one to make backyard in the Middle East, and has more submarines, and the equivalent of MIRV —and how we just must not slip doing the same. People, however, do not eat ICBM's. The discontent of the Russian masses, though not as obvious as that in the East European countries, is there... The truth is that both in absolute terms and in relative industries, Russia is "receding", not "surpassing" the U.S.

Whereas Russia does have the advantage over the U.S. is on the ideological front. Counter-revolutionary state-capitalist society was born out of a revolution; though it was transformed into its absolute opposite, Russia does remember the betrayed revolution's words. Lenin. Kolosovskii may still hope Communism can be "reformed" (under pressure, of course). Trotskyist may continue to speak of revolution while it tail-ends Stalingrad nationalized property. And Herbert Marcuse may remember that one needs at least one technologically advanced land whose proletarian could help the third world, which "should" learn about some sort of "peaceful co-existence" with such a land as Russia. But the truth is that Russia is out for world mastery just as is U.S. imperialism.

FOR THAT MATTER, so is Mao's China, which, at least since the 1960's, has been motivated by a single "principle" that it has never openly announced but always practiced: Russia is Enemy No. 1, and must be so recognized by the "revolutionary movement" the world over. Just now it is gibing over Egypt's expulsion of the Soviet "advisers." Sino did not expect Russian imperialism for revolutionary perspectives, but only in order to exchange, or at least bargain for more, be it from American imperialism or Gaullist military satelliteism... China does more now to clothe outright imperialism and genocidal warfare a la Pakistan in Marxist language and play the Dutch Heg "little people" game than even Russia, which has the greater counter-revolutionary experience.

It is no accident that Mao, who understands power very well indeed, wanted first, and foremost to learn all about atomic power. His displaying any fear of it may have shocked Hubb straight out of his wits in 1957, but handler as Mao was considered, the moment it was clear that Russia would not let him be privy to that power, the parting of the ways of the two "Communist" powers was inevitable.

And it is no accident that thought in all other respects, China is still a most backward country where per capita income is one of the lowest in the world —$145 per capita per year. China at once gave priority to the military... In three years it did what it took more industrialized and richer France eight years to achieve. And this year, 1972, China deployed a handful of new missiles with a range of 2500 miles. (Moreover it considers less than that from Chinese soil).

This does not mean that they are yet a match for Russia's awesome nuclear power, but China did begin to look like a serious threat to Russia in the wake of China's (I'm using "threat") Russia's 

Lord Nixon and state—capitalist crisis

IN A WORD, whether it is Russia, which has become an industrial power, but not the equal of U.S. imperialism, or whether it is China, which is nowhere near the U.S. or Russia—the equivalent in a similar world is the bomb... But would the beginnings of nuclear know-how—If you were in the center of Europe, faced Russia on the one hand, and, on the other hand, did not have the so-called nuclear umbrella of the U.S.—really make you a global power by economic strength alone? Let's examine Western Europe and see. Let's go on the assumption that it is a willing geopolitical entity—which it isn't. But it is an economic power. Its GNP is no less than $150 million—that is two-thirds of the strength of the U.S., no mean wealth. 1973 is supposed to be its "year of decision", as not only Great Britain becomes part of the Common Mar... (Continued on Page 78).
het, finally, but both France and West Germany face elections after very critical periods, especially in "Social Democracy" West Germany which initiated so phenomenal a turning point in post World War II politics as Ostpolitik.

Nevertheless, far from meaning a united West Europe, West Germany's new independence in its political stance was the major reason for France finally uniting Great Britain into the Common Market...

What was needed, in France's eyes that looked at the land mass all the way to the Urals as "Europe", its Europe, were a great many "counterweights". It is amusing at NATO talks and rushing back and forth to dieteticians, as it fears that May 1963 may not be quite as dead a year as it had thought.

That Russia now considers Ostpolitik a great victory for itself (and has made East Germany too the line accordingly) itself shows a very changed world from 1954 when Erhahon's very mention of contemplating a trip to West Germany contributed mightily to its downfall.

But what kind of change? Ah, there is the rub...

THE REALIGNMENTS are not of a class nature. They are inter-imperialist, inter-state-capitalist realignments, all aimed against the proletariat, the internal class enemy. And that class enemy, not in Ostpolitik of West Germany, but in true East Europe, has not stopped reaching for two full decades...

There is no doubt whatever that it is precisely because of the economic crisis, the class divorced, the alienated restless youth, the enemy forces of rebellion (watch how the nationalistic problem worries a Tito and brings over new strains in both East and West Europe)—that the changes have come. But to conclude from this that the Cold War is over, that there are multi-centers of nearly equal power, to substitute the convolutions of one's own head, for the class reality.

The class reality shows that the richest, the mightiest super power, U.S. imperialism — West Europe's, like Japan's "nuclear umbrella" — has not only not escaped from any of the ordinary ills of private capitalism, but likewise has had to plunge into a form of state-capitalism.

Let's examine the Nixon-style in the NEP, so highly tied to the ceaseless Vietnam War, and we will see that there has been no stepping of what Marx long ago called "the law of motion of capitalist production", which like a tidal wave carries capitalism to its downfall, even where this concerns the single mightiest power as well.
Pitting 'human nature' against Marx's humanism

By Naye Dunayer
Author of Marxism and Freedom

The intellectual's alienated life in a world in crisis and decay, his erratic empiricism and isolation from the worker, his failure to imbibe us with a more lasting participatory philosophy on the "backwardsness" of the proletariat. As if the 200 pages of "Alienation" weren't proof enough of that, Marx's analysis of humanism and humanism, the (p. 30) unity of idealism & materialism.

The unity of idealism & materialism is expressed by Marx and Marx (and again throughout the years) in the famous "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844". It is hard to think of a more profound concept of idealism and materialism which is the centerpiece of Ollman's book. So determined was Marx, in his criticism of capitalist alienation, to present the absolute opposites of this: labor as creative activity—that he separated himself from "voluntary communism" which thinks that alienated labor can be abolished through the abolition of private property. Marx, held that, crucially as it is to abolish private property, a new form of property (though he called it "collective") would not abolish what is most alienating in all-class society: the division between mental and manual labor.

Therefore, though the concept of communism with being "transcendence of private property," he concludes: "Not only by the transcendence of this mediation, which is the necessary presupposition, does there arise a new humanism, but also by the fact that, and that alone, would denote the end of the pre-history of mankind imposed by class society, and begin the true self-development of men and women by creating the new human dimensions which can come only with total freedom. Then, and only then, would we (1) There are many translations finally available of the Humanist essays of Marx, but the first to translate them for the American public was Bertell Ollman. I am quoting that translation which appeared as Appendix I to the first (1960) edition of Marxism and Freedom.

DIALECTICS VS. EMPIRISM

Far from having to go in for abstractions as to "human nature" to get a view of "future" "communist" society, the philosopher has his own, Marx was most specifically, rigorously and solely concerned with the concrete material society under which he lived, his "law of motion," the antagonistic class duality. He added labor (the reified labor, not just the products) out of which, nevertheless, dialectically emerges the "new passions and new forces" for upholding the old and reconstructing society in totally new, humanist foundations.

Just as Marx couldn't have written of capital without writing of its opposite, its gravest goliath, so he couldn't have written about the theory of alienation without an opposite, the philosophy of liberation Marx called "the new humanism." (Continued on Page 7)

(2) It is important to hold in mind that this is not from the early Humanist essay, but from Marx's greatest mature theoretical work, Capital (vol. 3, p. 944). This does not mean, as Bertell Ollman implies, that Marx's 20 years of mature work was a matter of gathering "supporting material" for his early works. That historical view tells the whole story about Ollman's disregard of Marx's self-development as well as of the historical development itself in those critical three decades when Marx was writing Capital.
DIALECTICS VS. LINGUISTICS

The trouble with Professor Olmaz, as with all optimists, is that he has reduced dialectics to a question of linguistics. The very first chapter of his book on Marx—"Words Like Hate"—holds that Parce has thereby made the most "profound observations...on our subject" for "one can see in Marx's (italics) both birds and mice." (p. 2) That attitude carries through the last chapter in which he writes: "If Marx is given highest marks for creating Marxism, he can only be given a mediocre rating for his skills as a conceptualizer." (p. 226) This is hardly an original critique on the part of academics. The great English economist, Joan Robinson, told me in all seriousness that she wished Marx had told all his views to Engels and had him present Marx's discoveries since Engels wouldn't have had Hegel "stick his nose between Ricardo and me."

Olmaz does her one better. He invents words for Marx: Marx's whole philosophy of liberation, his analysis of the law of motion of capitalist production, along with the antagonistic capital/labor production relationship, get subsumed under Olmaz's description of Marxism as a "philosophy of internal relations." In pursuit of his original "discovery," especially the capitalization of Relation, miracles are indeed wrought in "Marx's vocabulary" as Olmaz not only treats Marx and Engels as one on the very subject—dialectics—on which they must certainly were not identical (as note, indeed, knew better than Engels), but elevates Dialectics' primitive dialectics as the equivalent of Marx and Hegel (3)

I doubt that a single worker will understand Professor Olmaz's "vocabulary," but to the extent that it has helped some intellectuals understand Marx's historic analysis of reality (judging by the rave reviews Allesion has received), to that extent it has made a contribution which will, of necessity, send them to the study of Marx's work themselves. Or so we hope.

(3) Marx did all he could to spread Dialectics' writings because he was a worker and did try to grapple with dialectics, but in the serious correspondence about him, he denounced the fact that Dialectics hadn't studied Hegel. As he put it in his letter to Engels on Oct. 4, 1867: "My opinion is that J. Dialectics would do best to condense all his ideas into two printer's sheets...if he publishes them in the size he is proposing, he will discredit himself by the lack of dialectical development..."
China-Japan treaty paves way to build new world power axis in Asia

by Peter Mallery

The brief communiqué issued after five long days of discussions in Peking between the Prince Ministers of China and Japan from Sept. 26-30 conceals a great deal more than it reveals of the new world situation. It was clear from Nixon's journey to China that even cold-war warriors had decided that the time has arrived to brush away the moribund manner of ignoring the most populous nation on earth, and begin to face reality. But the speed with which Tanaka concluded a new agreement with China was a shocker.

By coming out of Nanking in 1946, but a "natural outcome" to Nixon's earlier journey to Peking, the truth is that not only is the China-Japan treaty a great deal more substantial, but a wholly new power-relationship has arisen in Asia.

For one thing, Tanaka wasted little time in establishing diplomatic relations, while Nixon employed more "face saving" gestures than Oriental customarily uses. For another, the trade advantages will be both substantial and immediate.

OF TRADE, MILITARISM, AND OTHER THINGS

This is not only a question of the usual capitalistic bust for both markets Japan hopes to get in China, or to ease the U.S.-Japanese balance of trade, which is now a total disaster. It is U.S. pressure on Japan to sell its goods elsewhere. Right now, Tanaka's big trade deals are in advance of anything conceived by Nixon.

Nixon may have thought that he was using China to discipline Japan by threatening possible new alliances, and then humoring Japan by showing it new avenues for the surplus Japan had been dumping on the American market. Bound by such grandiose illusions enemies fall.

Neither China nor Japan, however, were following Nixon's script. Quite the contrary, Japan is now using China to get some elbow room from U.S. over-powering grip, even as China is using Japan to gain some elbow room for itself away from Russia's grip. Meanwhile, neither the U.S. nor Japan's "abandonment" of Taiwan means any break in trade relations with Taiwan. The billions invested by both in Taiwan will not be withdrawn. Gradually the missions will be named "trade missions" and the output of Taiwan will continue to flow into the markets of the world.

The real elbow room is not in Taiwan. The first thing Tanaka did upon returning to Tokyo is announce that Japan will double its military budget by 1976, beginning the increase at once and beginning at once to build its own fighter planes instead of depending wholly on the U.S. And that trade U.S. imperialism did wish, but the urging that Japan should continue to buy all jet fighters from the U.S. because it was "cheaper" was disregarded by Tanaka.

WHY IS CHINA READY TO FORGET ALL?

The Joint communiqué issued by China and Japan on Sept. 26 expressed joint "friendship." While Japan had to do no more than say it was "sorry" for its past aggressions against China, China in fact gave up a great deal. Nothing was specified of the 41 years of Japan's attacks against her, beginning back in 1894 with the seizure of Manchuria, nor even its outright continuous military invasion 26 years ago, nor continuing through World War II. Moreover China gave up all claims to war reparations. Considering how much other (Continued on page 8)
countries invaded by Japanese militarists for much briefer periods had gained from Japan, that was no little thing to give up.

The reluctant speed with which such continuous imperialist warfare against her was swept under the bush Chinese rug, not to mention the silence on the present Japanese militarization (Chun Er-lai) had been loosely talking about in American reports just a few months back, makes it necessary to take a second look at that brief communique. The new element was not in giving up reparations, nor in the proclamation of "Who-chip." The new element was global. It resides in an "angle" statement that not only are China and Japan supposedly not seeking hegemony in the Asian-Pacific area, but that "each country is opposed to the efforts by any other country or group of countries to establish such hegemony." This innately appealing clause is aimed especially against Russia, and therein lies the whole "secret" of China's readiness "to forget all."

GLOBALLY SPEAKING

The anti-Russian stand has been the dominant factor in China's politics ever since the Sino-Soviet conflict came into the open in 1960, reacted one type of climate during the border incidents with Russia in 1969, and has been moving globally with the rolling out of the red carpet first to Nixon and now to Yosaka.

Clearly, Mao was as anxious for new relations with Japan as Japan with China, and not only for economic reasons, but also with the political aim of underwriting Russia's equally opportunistic goal when it sought agreements with Japan to industrialize Siberia. No doubt the whole idea of Russian-Japanese joint exploitation of Siberia's natural resources will have to be re-negotiated now that Japan has a few more cards up her sleeve.

If shivers run down Nixons's spine as he sees what a Pandora's box his little exploratory experiment in new global alignments has opened up, he isn't letting on. Which doesn't mean he isn't aware that the new stature Japan has gained in Asia was not just as a great industrial power, but as a political "friend" of China. Already some of the pundits are reminding the Administration that with China being the most populous nation in the world, and Japan the most industrial in Asia, the U.S. should not pressure Japan too hard.

Japan, for its part, has already informed the U.S. that it will not revalue the yen "unilaterally," no matter what pressures are put upon her — unless there is an "international agreement." Although politicians and

pundits alike are relying on the "natural," that is to say, cliques, interests that bind the U.S. and Japan, some are forgetting the double-cross they are also expert at playing. If Stalin-Hitler could negotiate a military pact, there is no reason to exclude the possibility of a Chinese-Japanese alliance.

AND WHERE IS THE NEW LEFT?

Big Power politics plays many steady gains, all at the expense of the masses, especially those in their own countries. There will be more than one double-cross among the Big Powers and the little once when the chips are down. That isn't the concern. What is of concern is the silence of the Left which can now illusions in its masses.

In desperation over the new reality, the Left has taken to talking about such half-truths as a Leninist stand on "monopoly of foreign trade" and elections. The truth is that the decisive anti-Vietnam war movement is being paralyzed as much by the Sino-Soviet orbit and conflict, as by Hanoi's grounded war (See Editorial, p. 4).

The silence of the "new left" on these events shows how anxious they are to take the China-Japan communique at face value and to evade the fact that China is playing global politics with militaristic Japan as well as with Nixon carrying on a genocidal war in Viet Nam.

In the game of global politics it is clear that both Russia and China are quite willing to betray North Viet Nam for the sake of their "larger" national and world objectives, just as eventually Hanoi will abandon the many new openings to the so-called Communist World for his Pax Americana.
What has happened to the Cuban revolution?

The Cuban Revolution: The Year After

In a few weeks the Cuban Revolution will mark the first year of its victory. It is no accident that its enthusiasm and unceasing alliance with the Russian orbit of power is almost as old. Contrary to the claims of the old radicals, who can no longer remember what constitutes principled working-class politics, this was not the only path open to it when it struck off the American imperialist yoke. The revolutions that preceded it—in the Middle East and in Africa—took advantage of the global division into two mutually-armed blocs fighting for world power to play off one against the other in its own national advantage. If Cuba chose to disregard this precedent and align itself with one of these power blocs, the answer cannot lie outside of fixed.

Fidelismo

Fidelismo was a movement that emerged in Cuba following the revolution of 1959. It was led by Fidel Castro and his supporters, who believed in the principles of socialism and communism. The movement aimed to build a new society based on equality and justice, and to oppose imperialism and capitalism. Fidelismo was a key component of the Cuban Revolution and played a significant role in the development of the Cuban state. It continues to be an important part of Cuban culture and politics to this day.
Russian tanks rolled over the Hungarian Freedom Fighters? Why should they only know of the discrimination against the Negroes in the South but not know of the extermination of nationalities opposed to Stalinism in Russia? Why should literacy be equated to illiteracy of the realities of a world divided into two, and only two, nuclear armed powers out for conquest of the world? Why not allow your own hero, Castro, to know some things about Russia—its system in foreign policy—which might easily result in its dropping of Cuba the minute it could get a “peaceful co-existence alliance” with America? Why, for that matter, not make yourself aware that this petty bourgeois lawyer is just as cynical and could an easily shift into alliance with the American State Department if it were to fit the only truly independent third force—the masses, wishing to mold their own destiny in their own minds and Fidel Castro, Che Guevara and the newly arisen state bureaucracy? There is one reason, and one reason only, behind all this self-imposed blindness to the realities of our state capitalist world. One and all are Planners who fear the spontaneity of the revolutionary masses more than anything else on earth, including state capitalism. Frederick, like Communists, Trotskyites like other radicals who thirst for power, share the capitalistic mentality of the “backwardness of the masses.” All are ready “to lead,” none to listen. It has been said of Jesus: “He could save all others. Himself he could not save.” It needs now to be said of the old radicals: They could save no one, and now they do not even want to save themselves. The one consoling feature in their impotence. Far from being capable of daunting the revolution, history will show them to be the doomed ones.
Two Worlds

Russia, China bring pressure on Hanoi to accept Pax Americana

By Rayo Dunayevskaya,
National Chairman, News & Letters Consultants

The Deputy Premier of North Vietnam, Le Thanh Nhip, suddenly flew into Paris on Dec. 10 to the Le Duc Tho-Kissinger talks were in recess, but the technicians were in session. General Haig had flown to Washington, and the rumors of peace were countless. The Deputy Premier had come directly from Moscow, where the day before he had concluded a new agreement with Russia for “large-scale deliveries of goods, equipment and other property of great significance.”

The “large-scale deliveries” have been essential in the relationship between Vietnam and Russia. USA has been pouring into South Vietnam and were also fast, even in Russian terms, than what Russia had given to Egypt. Nevertheless, the present timing and the pressures put on North Vietnam, over since the U.S. mining of Haiphong went unchallenged by Russia, have indeed opened a new stage.

THE TINY CARROT AND THE BIG STICK

China, which had been giving even less to its “great socialist ally,” had likewise dangled a little carrot and a big stick to make North Vietnam forget 25 years of struggle and battle and take action for independence, and instead, accept U.S. imperialism’s offer. Every time it had used the red carpet for Nixon, China, North Vietnam, could see China’s victory at the polls, which China claimed only because he did play a role in improving relations between the U.S. and China.

China’s criticism of Russia on this question was its usual picked-tongue kind: “The Soviet Union has publicly expressed the wish to see the war in Vietnam come to an end. But it is very difficult to differentiate between their true and their words.”

For that matter, so Nixon promised North Vietnam that he would help build it a “new and better” country, he was carrying on the genocidal bombing of the country and the unprecedented mining of its harbors. Anything, any thing at all, in order to get North Vietnam’s signature to a document of paper that would create the illusion of peace while everyone’s about to prepare the battle lines for the final war.

That there exist opposing big powers as the U.S., Russia, and China can all be true for the same thing—to create a temporary peace, bent toward saving more than the face of Naxi-Tian, a veritable “generations of power”—shows the absurd depths of global politics, looking to still the movement of freedom for national independence. Whether or not the unexpected end of the Vietnam war, even if only in a “cease-fire” form, is achieved ahead of time, this point is that it is not only U.S. imperialism that will not change its class nature, neither will the Stalinist world.

The fact that both Russia and China want the war ended doesn’t mean they both want the same thing. Each wants to be the dominant force—and not only in North Vietnam but in Southeast Asia. Yet the very fact that China can still look “revolutionary” makes it imperative that we probe deeper into its present role.

WHAT ABOUT CAMBODIA AND...

All China had to say on the question of Cambodia is that it was “more complicated” than the question of North Vietnam. That certainly isn’t all he had to say before Nixon’s visit to China. Quite the contrary. The one thing that China asked in a revolutionary way was the time of the U.S. invasion of Cambodia. Moreover, this was not merely because it attacked U.S. imperialism’s invasion; Russia did not ask. Nor was it only because, unlike Russia, China did not continue its relations with the Naorian counter-revolutionary regime and gave sanctity to Prince Sihanouk. Rather, it was because China had the good sense to stay in the background while the Khmer revolutionaries of Cambodia, the North Vietnamese, and the Viet Cong, as well as the revolutionary forces from Laos and Thailand, met to work for a unified front against the U.S.

All this changed the minute the détente with U.S. imperialism became serious. All talk of the “continuation of revolution” became nothing but a whitewash for a “philosophy” of counter-revolution as Mao’s China sets out to double-cross Cambodia and help betray North Vietnam.

What has characterized China as well as Russia over these fateful meetings with Nixon is that their ally, North Vietnam, counts for nothing at all. And when North Vietnam dared to continue its own battle in the spring offensive last year, both Russia and China were big on words and all on action as U.S. imperialism carried out the most massive bombing ever. There is, in fact, evidence enough that Nixon planned this in full confidence that Russia and China would not come seriously to the defense of North Viet nam. The whole operation against Hanoi was carefully planned to coincide with the announcement of trips to Moscow and Peking.

THE UNHEARD VOICE

North Vietnam’s voice (Aug. 17, Nhan Dan editorial) read: “To carry out the ‘Mao doctrine’ U.S. imperialists have applied the policy of reconstitution in order to get the North Vietnamese to accept a number of big powers in the hope of having a free hand to consolidate their forces, suppress the revolutionary movement, suppress the revolution at home, build the social system, prepare for the liberation movement, and not relinquishing its plan to prepare a new world . . . . if not the narrow interests of one nation, one tries to help the most reactionary forces to create the dangerous blow, (or the) just like having a knife-in-the-back a drolling pirate . . . .”

The fact that Russia and China can march in opposite directions so long as each one’s national interests are concerned, and yet fight against the same target if there is a national independent movement for national liberation, shows just how little are the three imperialist countries calling themselves Communist. That has been the characteristic ever since the Sino-Soviet split be came the Sino-Soviet conflict in 1960. But never before have their actions been so tied in with the dominant world imperialist power, the USA.

The tragic truth is that to each of these “Communist” big powers, the others and the U.S. is Enemy Number One.

North Vietnam, in peace as in war, will remain a
Both powers bear the responsibility among the Communist nations for the improvement of the world's economic and political situation. It must also be noted that the People's Republic of China has announced its intention to establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.

The question of the relationship between these two powers is of utmost importance. The People's Republic of China has repeatedly expressed its willingness to maintain friendly relations with the Soviet Union and to cooperate with it in the struggle against imperialism and for peace. The Soviet Union has also reaffirmed its desire to maintain friendly relations with the People's Republic of China and to strengthen its ties with it.

The development of these relations will be of great significance for the international situation. The two powers have played a leading role in the development of the anti-imperialist movement and have made significant contributions to the cause of peace and prosperity. The maintenance of friendly relations between these two powers will be a strong factor in promoting international peace and stability.

The development of diplomatic relations between the two powers will also contribute to the strengthening of the unity of the Communist nations. The People's Republic of China has repeatedly expressed its desire to establish diplomatic relations with all the other Communist nations, and the establishment of such relations will be a significant step in the further consolidation of the unity of the Communist nations.

In conclusion, the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two powers is of great significance for the development of the international situation. It will contribute to the strengthening of the unity of the Communist nations and to the promotion of international peace and stability.

The people of all countries are looking forward to the establishment of friendly relations between the two powers. They are confident that the development of these relations will bring about a better world.
Lukács' Philosophic Dimension

TWO WORLDS
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By Rayna Dumayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom

Part I

1973 marks the 50th anniversary of the publication of History and Class Consciousness, and is sure to increase the dairy of articles, pamphlets and even whole books about its late famous author, Georg Lukács. These have been pouring forth the past few years from both the New Left (1) and the old Left press, 1955 STANDS BETWEEN 1923 AND 1973

In 1920, on the other hand, when Lukács briefly participated in the Hungarian Revolution despite a full quarter century of capitulation to Bolshevism, the Hungarian Communists who helped the Russian counter-revolution destroy the revolution and execute its leader, Lénine Nagy, expelled Lukács from the Party and unbound him another vitriolic attack on his 1923 seminal study on Hegelian-Marxian dialectics. The tragedy lies not in any change in the stance of the Communist Party between 1920 and 1923; it seems to have changed its counter-revolutionary nature since when the first workers’ state, Russia, was transformed into its absolute opposite, a state-capitalist society. The tragedy lies in two altogether different spheres. One is Lukács’ new, monumental work, Social Ontology, which he considered the greatest of his life, which he was completing when he died on June 7, 1971. Whether only because this philosophic work was abstract enough to be incomprehensible ever, or because the Philipine Dimension, which he devoted two special issues (Winter 1971 and Spring 1972) plus a “memorial statement” (Spring 1971), but the first was preceded by a detailed study by Paul Piccon, “Lukács’ History and Class-Consciousness, Half a Century Later” in The Fall 1966 issue, see also a book of poems, The Unknown Dimension, edited by Dick Howard and Earl R. Kirak (Basic Books, N.Y., for a hefty $15.65).

Part II


The philosophy foundation both for the Great Divide in Marxism, and for the Russian Revolution as well as for new world revolutionary perspectives. Lukács highly shows his work had caught the revolutionary spirit of the period, 1917-21: “A monstrous world-historical change was struggling to find a theoretical expression.” (p.xix) He also points to the truth that “undoubtedly one of the great achievements of History and Class Consciousness was to have revealed the category of totality in the central position it had always occupied throughout Marx’s work…” This, however, is followed up with a declaration about not knowing that Lenin was “moving in a similar direction.” (p.xx) Suddenly there comes the unprintable and unprintable unprintable reference to Lenin’s Philosophic Notebook as “philosophic fragment” that were only published nine years after the appearance of History and Class Consciousness, 1923 work, History and Class Consciousness, with a most ambivalent new Preface included. (2)

The only reference the 1955 Preface makes to the 1925 Revolution is that there is no “incoherence” between the fact that in 1925 I had more reason then to take to a multilateral (1) post” (p.xxi) and the fact that he had had given up political activity in the mid-1920s. As if taking on political activities — “making revolution” — hadn’t related to revolutionary dialectics, and giving up politics hadn’t “colored” (in Stalin’s day and now) with renunciation of, and retreat from History and Class-Consciousness. Lukács concludes that he is glad to be out of politics even when he was correct “there must be grave defects in my practical political abilities.” (p.xxi) Well, it isn’t his “political abilities” we are concerned with. The reason for devoting to the Preface is not “political” but the disjunctiveness of revolutionary philosophy from revolutionary activity.

THE 1957 PREFACE

It isn’t the political double-ness that manifests Lukács’ philosophic retreat from working out today’s revolutionary dialectics in the forthcoming Social Ontology (in which we’ll return later). In the Preface this manifests itself in places where he is full of praise of Lenin, but in fact doesn’t stand on Lenin’s philosophic ground. And I don’t mean Lenin’s pre-1914 mechanistic Materialism and Empiric-Dualism, but his ground-breaking 1914-15 Philosophic Notebooks (3), which had
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Class Consciousness." (p. xxv) (4)

Now, to have discovered, no matter when, that the revolutionary spirit of the age was not only sought as it objectively developed, but prepared for by Lenin back in 1914 via his "return" to Heidegger after the collapse of the Second International, should have been an exciting event and philosophical adventure that the profound philosopher Lukács couldn't have possibly dismissed into factual dating of publications relative to one "knowing" or "not knowing" about them in 1911-12. If his 1928 essay had been attuned to the living revolutionary forces, shouldn't his recollection of the "mysterious make-believe" that was struggling to find a theoretical expression, 1916-1922, have led him to concentrate his praise of "Lenin really brought about a renewal of the Marxist method," by grappling with Lenin's manuscripts instead of skipping over those "fragments"? (5) Insofar as a good distance from 1912, by which time not only Lenin's manuscripts, but Marx's 1844 Human Historical Essays had finally been published, it is true that Lukács' 1923 work had anticipated the essays on "Alienated Labor" and "Critique of the Heidelberger Dialektik." But Marx's essays also contained the sharp conclusion that "communism, as such, is not the goal of human development, the form of human society," which Lukács neither anticipated, nor knew how to relate to.

In any case, Lukács never reviewed either Lenin's or Marx's strictly philosophical works. This failure has nothing whatever to do with dates, but a great deal to do with the fact that Lukács is developing the dialectics of revolution, not of ontology. Whether his monumental work, Historical Materialism, will prove to be not only his greatest work, but that dialectics of the concrete which the New Left expects all revolutionary forces to be grounded in, the indirect references to it in the new Preface to History and Class Consciousness does not help enhance that Preface. It isn't the Preface that will enter history, but the original work. The absence of the Preface can no more detract from that epoch-making event than the author's renunciation of the book under Stalinism could keep it from having a most exciting underground life of its own.

One final word must be said before we can finally turn to its contents, and that is to History and Class Consciousness isn't a book, i.e., a whole. (6) It is a collection of essays, and not all are of historic import. The two philosophical essays carried on a subterranean existence for a full half-century which has reanimated the whole, but the Historio-philosophic breakthrough enables us to take two central ideas—What Is Orthodox Marxism? and Realization and the Consciousness of the Proletariat. It is to these we now turn.

(To be continued)

(4) Actually, the dating is wrong. Even before Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks were published in Moscow, not 1912, but in 1922-24, sections of them began to be published here after Lenin's death, as various factional fights developed. In view of the fact that many among the "New Left," with mailboxes afterthought, are enthusiastically quoting the Communist June 19 attack on Lukács' work with Lenin's 1923 critique of the policies of the Left-Left in "Left-Wing" Communism, so the "New Left," with mailboxes afterthought, devoted far too many hours to the "New Left," with mailboxes afterthought, of 1923. Lenin's activity was finished when the second attack hit him on March 16, 1922; he died Jan. 21, 1924.

(5) Actually, he is the original (Kritusains, 1965) Preface, made the claim with his very first sentence: "The collection and publication of these essays is not intended to give them a greater importance as a whole than they would be due to each individually." (p. xiv.)
What is orthodox Marxism?

By Maya Dumayo

Author of Marxism and Freedom

PART II

"Hegel's tremendous intellectual contribution consisted in the fact that he made history and history dialectical and relative to each other, gripped them in a dialectical reciprocal perestroika..."

—Lukacs.

It was the most unorthodox character of "What Is Orthodox Marxism?" that fired the imagination of German revolutionaries when it was first published in 1918 and again when it reappeared in revised form as part of the book, History and Class Consciousness, published in 1923.

Then, by the end of the 1920s, the work was repudiated by its author as he made peace with Stalinism, the essay carried on many antagonistic existence in many languages in different parts of the world; first, for those who had broken with Stalinism in the 1920s and 1930s; then for some of the "new philosophers"—French Existentialists, especially Marcuse and Sartre—in the mid-1950s; and, finally, for those in the new generation of revolutionaries in the 1960s who, out of their own experiences, were turning away from their parents' generation to restate its "world view" of the dialectics of liberation.

The enduring reference of the essay is the proof of the fact that its explosive effect was by no means limited to the fact that it had anticipated the rediscovery of Marx's new-born Hegelianism, which demonstrated how deeply rooted in Hegelian dialectics and theory of alienation were Marx's "Alienated Labor" and "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic.

In re-establishing Marxism as a totality, now one opposing view to the Marxist author of Capital, Lukacs presented himself as an avenging knight in the trenches of the working class.

THE REVOLUTIONARY DIALECTIC

In naming these of those who had not worked out the full implications of the revolutionary nature of the Marxist dialectic, Lukacs did not stop short of criticism of Marx's closest colleagues, Engels, who "does not even mention the most vital interaction, namely the dialectical interplay between subject and object in historical process" (p. 3).

The whole weight of his study in Marxist dialectic was in the stress on the "transformation of reality": "It is at reality itself that Hegel and Marx part company. Hegel was unable to penetrate the real driving forces of history." (p. 17) It is true that Lukacs himself is oversimplified "dialectics" of the proletariat so that he overrated the prehistory which was the material force and reason so that it left room, at one and same time, for a slip back into the Hegelian idealism of the "identified subjectivity," and into substituting the Party that "knows" for the proletariat, but more noted this in the excesses committed by the essay's recuperation of the revolutionary dialectical dimension of humanistic materialism which gave its direction to his thought: "Mankind is the guardian of tradition, it is the eternally vigilant prophet proclaiming the relation between the task of the immediate present and the totality of the historical process." (p. 12) And that "historical process" was then covered by the internationalism proclaimed in the Communist Manifesto and in the Paris Commune which Marx specified as having "no ideals to realize" but "to liberate the historical society of the new society."

REFLECTION

"The essay, "Reflection and Consciousness of the Proletariat," has neither the movement and verve of the first essay, nor its "orthodoxy" (and I'm using the word in the Lukesian sense of authentique Marxism). There is no doubt, however, that it is the center of History and Class Consciousness, made (this is not always a matter of it being the longest piece). (As against this 28 pages of the first essay, the essay on reflection, detailed in less than 12 pages.) Lukacs could have called it a book, but, instead, took care to slip away from claiming for it a totally new departure, a work-out whole alternative, the intellectuals took it as such. It became the fashion to talk about "reflection," "the reflective world we live in." They may very well have antithesized, by three full decades, the intellectual rage around "One Dimensional Man," "One Dimensional Thought," "Technological rationality," the move away from Reason to irrationality, or the reversion from ontology to technology.

The "masses" (the mass and file) in the subterranean discussion of Lukacs' book, on the other hand, kept their peace not merely because of lack of knowledge of "the history of philosophy," but because of a solid proletarian instinct that this was not merely a return of Marxism for a new epoch, but rather that it contained elements deviant from that which was authentic Marxism.

First and most important of the distinctive between the two concepts of reflection is that Marx had limited his analysis to the reification of labor, transforming it into things, a move analogous to the Hegelian, Lukacs on the other hand, has transformed reflection into a universal, affecting the whole of society equally; "Reflection is, then, the necessary, immediate reality of every person living in capitalist society. It can be overcome only by the event and effects of an a priori, the reconstitution of the reification of labor, by becoming conscious of the immanent meanings of these contradictions of the totality of development." (p. 107)

Here, then, we see that reflection is universalized, made a veritable "human condition" "every period, is affected equally."

And "becoming conscious" is endowed with a "naturally," though Lukacs a revolutionary and quotes endlessly from Marx as he does how the proletariat, and the proletariat alone, is the revolutionary force to create new human relations, it does not flow either logically or objectively, either historically or dialectically from his original source.

When Marx, the protagonist of the revolutionary dialectic, analyzes reflection as resulting from the specifically capitalistic production process of the reflection of labor, pointing labor into thing, and thereby creating in the laborer the absolute opposite—the "quest for universality" and the revolt—Lukacs has totally the Marxist concept of "free-associated labor" stripping the fetishism from human, the the transcendence of alienation, shaping history.

Ironically enough, it was Lukacs who—in recognizing the Hegelian dimension in Marx; in delivering might men to the world with a new and inconceivably great project—was his greatest contribution to authentic Marxism by illustrating and making clear to his dialectic the inter-rerelationships of the concepts of "totality" and "mediation."
In reviewing, in the 1937 Preface, what he had meant to do and what he had done, he thinks that, on the one hand, "alienation" sans objectivity was "in the air," and, on the other hand, "scientific exploitation" led to a residue of idealism. And he adds that concerning the whole question of the "relation of "mediation in im-
mediacy" of "economics and dialectics" that he had been working in Sismondy in the early thirties: "Only now, thirty years later, am I attempting to discover a new solution to this whole problem in the ontology of social 
existence." (Preface)

PART III

THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION VIS-A-VIS "SOCIAL ONTOLOGY"

"The 1956 Revolution, with Lukacs suddenly appearing as a participant, revived hopes that, despite his quarter of a lifetime of capitalist experience and disillusion, Lukacs would continue the revolution in thought it brought in the early 1930s.

Every new stage of cognition is, after all, not born out of thin air. It can be born only out of practice, the praxis of new revolutionary forces uprooting the exisiting social order, and the Hungarian masses were directing their revolt not against private capitalism which had already been shaken, but against the exist-
ing exploitative, ruling Communist state-power, or, more precisely put, state-capitalism calling itself Communism. 

With this new mass upsurge, its struggle for new freedom, there was every reason to expect the old philosopher would catch what, in the 1930s, he had called, "a momentous, world-historical change...struggling to find a theoretical expression." 

The criticism leveled against Lukacs by independent Marxist seemed to lose its validity, especially as much of it had the character of Monday morning quarterbacking and was based on "windmills" the knowledge of some three to four decades of objective development. Considering the excitement of the 1956 epoch, there were serious mistakes and errors over the philosophical dimensions of Lukacs and its impatient waiting for the comprehensive Social Science. Comrade G. had been writing for a decade and to which he had referred in the last years as having been the product of three decades of thought, it would indeed have been a joy to report to present a historical breakthrough—a new stage in cognition that met the challenge of the speculative upsurge from below, the Hungarian Revolution.

Unfortunately, nothing could be further from the truth. The truth is that, whatever deviant—deviant, not ideologically—illusion-Lukacs was guilty of in the "Ref-
nication" article, "translation of consciousness" affected Lukacs, who reduced activism to the perfection of Indus-
trial production achieving the Plan (8)

"MEDITATION"

Take a most crucial Hegelian category, and one central to Lukacs’ dialectics, Mediation. As conceived by Marx, and the one Lukacs discussed first, it was first, inseparable from the most fundamental of all Hegelian categories, their utopian, Subject, Secondly, and most important—since that revealed a totally new content of thought, Historical Materialism—Marx his-
terically, philosophically, dialectically specified Subject out as Proletariat. In a word, Marx didn’t simply stand Hegel right up side down, didn’t only critically transform Hegel’s concept of labor as process of man’s becoming, much less leave it in the realm of thought. No, as laborer, the proletarian was both opposing the capital-
istic exploitation and reduction of all his concrete labor to one abstract mass by that "penumbra of the clock," and toward "universalism." Thus, he became reason as well as force, reshaped history, created new beginnings for totally new human relations.

Whatever duality there was in Lukacs, and whatever abstraction—because of the emphasis on "moral-
ly" and "other"—the point is that the concept of con-
crete totality escaped him, despite the fact that totality,

(Continued on Page 7)
Two Worlds

Mao & Nixon move closer together

by Raya Dunayevskaya

National Chairwomen, Women & Labor Committees

On March 15 Nixon announced that on May 1 a "liaison mission" would be opened in Peking and would be headed by David Bruce. If the euphemism of "liaison officer" could possibly have fooled anyone, Mr. Bruce's super-ambassado-
dorital post put an end to such delusions.

Ever since Nixon made his trip to China, a year ago, many observers have been speculating that a relationship similar to that achieved by Nixon, the China Lobby man, the anti-Communist, the war hawk. But in truth, the greater transformation into opposition was Mao's embrace of "Enemy Number One" in the specific person of what Mao's China used to call "that ugly imperialist chindian." Then, nothing other of the internal crisis - which brought about nothing short of the death (execution?) of Mao's "chiefest corrobates-in-crime and successor," Marshal Lin Piao - or the external condition that there is but one China, the "two" Nixon sponsored in the US and still recognizes as "China," i.e., Taiwan, was permitted to slow the speed-up of closer relations with the U.S.

Thus, the joint communiqué had oficially stated that the U.S. would "progressively reduce its forces and military installation on Taiwan as the tendency in the area (Vietnam) diminishes." Nothing of the sort was done. For that matter, hardly anyone believes that peace has come to Vietnam. China's anxiety to move ever more closer to the U.S. is, however, so great that no imperialist action by the U.S. against others can stop it.

No wonder that Nixon in the very same conference in which he made his announcement of new relations with China, used his most authoritative voice to warn North Vietnam that if the enemy fires "voluntarily" continue, he will use all possible means to oppose or destroy them.

MAO ANY KISSINGER

Suspended over the front pages of all three major publications in China - The People's Daily, The Red Flag, and The Liberation Army - were pictures of Henry Kissinger with Mao Tse-tung. Day in and day out, for the four days Kissinger spent in Peking and Beijing, the Chinese press followed up the picture display of Mao and Kissinger with commentary that stressed to the Chinese masses that Mao was talking to a very good friend. They had told Kissinger: That was twice as much as with Nixon. He was telling a very good friend to be sure to greet both and greater friend, the President.

Promptly the Western "specialists" began writing, "this smile was almost as significant as the meeting itself... It set the stage for further development of Chinese-American relations." (David Crane, Times, London, Feb. 18, 1973.) And so it did.

No wonder that Kissinger's smile upon his return looked like that of the cat who just swallowed the canary. This "casual" appearance masked the unawareness of the vast expansion of Chinese power wherever a quarter of mankind live. The denials that Mao is the brain of Dr. Kissinger might well mar Mao's future "great leap forward." But now, however, Mao is giving for a global leap that he expects will outRussia in the 1970s.

It is not obvious from the single statement that the total China-North Vietnam situation, that Mao and Kissinger "had a frank and wide-ranging conversation in an uncontrasted atmosphere." It is uncontrasted, this presumably "uncontrasted atmosphere" which worries Russia. She is sure that secret agreements, directed against her, are in the making. What is of most immediate and political consequence to the new global game between China and the U.S. - and in this Russia is equally gullible - is the seclusion of the North Vietnam War.

It is necessary to take a second look at the war that is now called "peace with Vietnam, again and again."

Nothing else than the myth of U.S. Imperialism that the fact that they get Russia and China to work with them to bring North Vietnam to sign a Nixon-style "peace with honor" which means that Vietnam was giving up its main demand for an agreement that would not separate politics from the military. Once Nixon's number one priority in Vietnam - keeping China in power - was agreed to, and the POWs were released, Nixon was free to tax many other avenues of global realignment.

For that purpose, this time as always and always as Big Powers, China and Russia are lining up. In 1964, when they were "out," Russia and China worked in concert to compel North Vietnam to give up its victory against the French for "peaceful coexistence" with U.S. imperialism, in 1973, when they themselves are engaged in a life-and-death game, they still work equally hard to make North Vietnam the sacrificial lamb.

As the arrogant Dr. Kissinger put it to Marvin Kalb of CBS: Vietnam took an "outside influence." The Chinese have been recognized as only "an appendage to the land mass of Asia." Put this human language... makes that the Vietnam war, "international," can continue on endlessly and not a single one of the powerful superpowers will give a hoot. No matter what, Vietnam will now be kept, as the back burner, will not be permitted to influence global realignment, much less the timing or the idea for world holocaust.

Nothing demonstrates more clearly in our nuclear age not only that small, but that in general, nothing, that there are three (and only three, not five) Super Powers, then the geest - with which the international conference was held in Paris. First, it was clear that the international "peace conference" had been convened merely to sign what had already been worked out by the U.S. and agrees to it, not merely with Vietnam, North or South, but with Russia and China.

Secondly, everything ground to a halt the moment Nixon announced he was going to talk and with the delay of the release of the POWs and ordered Secretary Rogers to get North Vietnam moving faster and faster.

Thirdly, even while it was still at a distance, what really counted was Roger's meeting with China's ambassador on the matter of the $50 million of private American claims against China, and the $500 million that the U.S. had impounded of Chinese money. The fact that this too was agreed to so speedily shows that everything, absolutely everything, was subordinated to Mao's pre-occupation with getting Nixon to see Russia as "Enemy Number One."

THE SORROWS OF THE MASS MEDIA

The daily press, the "socialist media," the "academic community" have, in concert, projected the counterpart to Nixon's political conversion into mystical brainwashing in totalitarian lands; moreover, they are self-deceived. So great is the falsity of this criticism of the country; so total is the fear of something worse even than the Vietnamese nightmare; as "peace with honor" is shown to be a continuation of the war with slightly modified means, that the thought to end in a global holocaust; as absolute is the frustration of everything - that it is impossible to bring their eyes while blurring their heads against the stone wall of Nixon's reaggrandization on the home front.
that, at one and the same time, an unparalleled crisis
precedes the land, and, with it, basically enough, the
emergence of an emulsion to the old capitulation
to the China Lobby during the McCarthy period.

One famous columnist, Joseph Alsop, let one cat
out of the bag. That super-bad anti-Communist has
been writing like any true "Manitou" on all the super-
achievements of Mao China, especially so in the trans-
formation of man himself—70 million souls at that; in
summing up his great adventure of the month (NY Times
Magazine, Mar. 11 and 25, 1972) he has added
that the reason for his invitation to visit China evidently
was that he had been writing, exposing Russia's military
buildup in Russia on territory facing China. In
truth, no sooner did he step off the plane in
Peking than he and his Chinese officials—first
with the Foreign Ministry Information Department; then
with editor of the People's Daily and the China
News Agency; then the "brilliant Vice-Minister of Foreign
Affairs, China Xunhua"; and finally, the crimson face
talk with Chou. All the conversations were "unpre-
tentiously planned as a military policy," all revolving
around and against Russia, all on the single topic of
an alleged "preventive war" Russia is planning against
China. Chou, Alsop reports, spoke grimly of Russians
"seeking to organize support for just such an attack
among other Western Communist countries.

No wonder that, rather than feeling such a horror,
every one from hawk to the true Maoist is ready to
back up the vast espousal China has been putting into
building underground air shelters. Thereby they hope
to create a besieged atmosphere to get their masses to
work endlessly. All the while, the leadership is preo-
cupled with nothing short of an alliance with "the
horrors"—Nixon of the US.

WILL MAO AND NIXON MOVE INTO AN
ALLIANCE AGAINST RUSSIA?

The same is true of the fact that the British
and Italian foreign secretaries—SIR Alec Douglas-
and Giuseppe Mazzini—reported that this was
"all but true" about the subject that China had with him.
In a word, what is involved in the whole move towards
relating with the US is a further forward an alliance
against Russia.

The collaboration with the USA is nowhere near
such a fantastic stage. Cultural exchanges are hardly
the admiration of Mao and Brezhnev. But the somewhat
more important economic relations—such as China's $150
million purchase of Boeing's airplanes, or the $100
million of General Electric's claims against China and,
in turn, the $7 billion America Impounded that
depends to China.

What is important is (1) the speed with which all this
was initiated, and (2) that the international conference
to conjoin the Vietnam "peace" was subordinated to the
anti-Russia theme. In other words, Russia was having
with China's Foreign Ministry, Chi Pengelo on three claims
and counter-claims—each one over two decades
but resolved in two days. The door is opened to closer
relations but that is all.

Nixon is also negotiable on an even wider door open
to Russia. And he is trying to meet the fences he broke
down with the US in Europe and Japan—when
he moved unilaterally against both as he faced money
crisis and recession in China. Nixon, the total retrac-
ee-might in the home front against Blacks, against
peace, against the people, moving standby, be for
and against state intervention in the economy, has not
changed an iota in its reactionary views of Pax American
the world over.

Nixon's spectacular journey to Peking was to open
doors and give himself, and himself alone—is, i.e., U.S.
imperialism—new options for global realignment. This
didn't mean only an opening toward China. As his
"follow-up" journey to Russia showed, he wasn't closing
that door.

Since then, the journeys by Kissinger and Spiro Ag-
new in Southeast and East Asia were to spin even more
from Japan to Thailand of U.S. imperialism's "contin-
ued presence." The existing blocs may grab more
headlines, but Spiro Akers's study quietly journeys
over to all the reactaries in Asia, Nixon's utterance
of "political promises" his client to see such
vastness exists, and his assurance to one and all that he
is an "instantiator" and not to stand up to U.S. "global
responsibility."

At the same time, the Nixon journey got both of the
contending "Communists" super-powers to collabo-
rate with him even as he was bombing North Vietnam.
They fired North Vietnam to the signature table and
gave Nixon his "peace with honor" by not demanding
the removal of his puppet Thieu. As for the journalists,
they do Nixon better by writing as if China can
prove her allegations about Russia's "threat to a pre-
ventive war" and as if they have proof that the Sin-
Soviet Confrontation has its high point only after Russia
invaded Czechoslovakia. The facts speak differently.

SINO-SOVET RIVALRY

There is no doubt about two of Russia's imperialist acts:
the invasion of Czechoslovakia; and the other,
the buildup of the northern frontier facing China. An-
other truth, however, is that Mao's China took the
initiative against Russia long, long before the latter's
invasion of Czechoslovakia. No sooner had Stalin died
than Mao wanted to abrogate, not so much the Tsarist
treaties, as the one he made with Stalin in 1950.
Whatever shock Khrushchev may have gotten from
Mao's request that Mongolia be returned to China and
whatever he put in the back of his head to be sure
to remember if they came to blow it later, did not at
once become the basis for their policies. On the con-
trary, what help China did get from Russia and it was
a great deal more than she ever got from Stalin—
during the Khrushchev period. The disagreements that
gained to a boil in 1960 were, again, due to Moscow's
initiative.

You may call them theoretical or you will. You may
call them revolutionary if you dare. The point is that
by the mid-60's, when U.S. imperialism raised hens
in Vietnam, Mao refused a united front with Russia
for help Vietnam. He still kept up the claim that, not so
much Vietnam as China was the besieged fortress. Noth-
inging, not even his own Political Committee, could make
him modify his line to build a friendly aid Viet-
man. On the contrary, it is then, precisely then, he un-
leashed the "Great Protest against Reaction"
and even allowed that to stop some of Russia's ship-
ments to Vietnam.

This doesn't mean Russia gave all it could to Viet-
am. But it was an era when the sun shone upon China
to fight a war against a "com-Communist" until the state
invaded another "socialist land" to participate in one
vast wasteland. Indeed, Mao has gone so far into play-
ning global politics not only in Asia but in West Europe as to
practically "overthrow" NATO, i.e., not to oppose U.S.
presence in West Europe — anything, anything at all
that might be used against Russia. The fact that Russia
plays the same global game proves neither is a
"socialist land." Both are imperialist countries.

It isn't that Russia differs from China; it, too, pur-
sues his own national interests which in our mature age
includes Big Power imperialism. It, too, considers China
"the enemy," as the military buildup and frontier "in-
cidence" in 1969-72 show; and it, too, flirts with both the
U.S. and the above everywhere. Russia, like China,
is in a big enough hole at home to need every-
thing from economic "aid" from the U.S. to possible
collusion in any realignment of global powers. Nothing

(token)
has yet been decided. Everything is up, if not yet grasped, then to be gotten at a very high price.

The worst thing possible would be for the New Left to take sides instead of striking out on an independent road.

THE ANTI-VIETNAM WAR MOVEMENT, WHERE TO?

Two equally wrong tendencies vie with each other within the "New Left:" One sees the "revolutionary nature" of any (especially the Chinese) attack on "Russian revisionism." The other concentrates on one thing and one thing only—to aid in the reconstruction of Vietnam—even if this means working somewhere within the establishment.

As if these haven't been enough disorientation with "single-issue" preoccupation in the anti-Vietnam war movement, I. F. Stone (New York Review of Books, March 8, 1968) now writes, "The peace movement has no more important task than to focus attention on the Church-Case and Bingham Bills" to tie Nixon's hands against renewed intervention. It would also tie the New Left's hands to a section of the bourgeoisie.

The only thing that will get us out of the mess of tailoring any state power, least of all U.S. imperialism in its Nixonite era, is to recognize that, just as the enemy is always at home and so is the revolution, in that same integrated whole there is no way to separate philosophy from revolution without sacrificing the road, not to revolution, but to retrogression. It is high time to strike out on an independent road to total freedom.

April 1973
Gang lawyer for the establishment

and a half before he could take his bar exam. Every college student knows the type, the opportunist with brains and connections who develops them as fast as possible in order to get them at the disposal of the highest bidder. Cohn didn’t have to wait long. The moment he passed his bar exam, a job was waiting for him as Confidential Assistant to the United States Attorney in New York.

OUTSIDE THE LAW

The Government gave Cohn the opportunity he needed. The Communists were being prosecuted for conspiracy. While the legal forms were being maintained in Court, a special department was set up by the Attorney General to deal with all radicals. The boy who had been born with a silver spoon in his mouth was now worth the weight in gold. While other governmental attorneys hesitated to bring in anti-Communist radicals under the same law which prosecuted Communists, Cohn was unhampered by any democratic tradition. He justified the means, legal or not. The older more respectable attorneys protested, but in the end they always capitulated. Cohn knew that he could always sweep them along.

All they wanted to do was go more slowly but their ends were no different than his. Cohn gathered around him a gang of younger men, as ruthless and ruthless as he, anxious to put their highly-trained brains at the service of the most powerful bidder.

Now that his ability to bully his more liberal colleagues into illegal actions had been proven, Cohn did not stay long with the U.S. Attorney. He was looking for more fertile fields. The new U.S. Attorney was anxious to move more slowly, to stay within the law. McCarthy needed a lawyer on his staff, as unscrupulous and as brazen and as shameless as he.

McCarthy and Cohn joined forces. McCarthy’s attorneys and investigators were as unscrupulous as Cohn’s, but his manner is shrewd, sneering. Cohn brings to the proceedings the vigorous brashness which paralyzes the opposition with its offensiveness.
Editorial Article: Politics of Counter-Revolution

Watergate and the 'Year of Europe'

By Raya Dunayevskaya

National Chairwoman, NAL Committees

Brushed over by the June salvage operation in Nixonland, undermined by Watergate, hasn't saved Nixon's ill-white skin. As against 1972 (when Man, too, was directly involved in shielding Nixon), the second time around for Brezhnev-Nixon summity could not cleanse Nixon of the Watergate stench.

As for the "Year of Europe", the Nixon-Pompidou non-event in Ireland May 26 should have shown our Emperor's intellectual fornicar, Dr. Erich Honecker, that the warm and seductive relations between Nixon and Brezhnev could only further assure the unravelings of Europe that a repeat of Vails (which did not Europe's fate without the presence of Europe at the end of World War II) may be in the making between the two nuclear Goliaths.

Indeed it needed no shout from the grave (and even Tedious grandee) to see through Honecker's argument in reducing Europe's national interests to "Regional" ones, while raising Nixon's Pan-American ambitions to global visions for "All".

Meanwhile our totalitarian President's criminal attempt to set up a single Party State within the two-party system was too fascinating a tale to keep the people from watching the TV spectacular: the Senate Watergate Hearings.

WHAT THE TV HEARINGS DON'T SHOW

Ever since Senator Ervin's Committee opened TV hearings to the Watergate criminality, Nixon has unconvincingly offered his new set of surrogates. True, they look a bit cleaner than those who got him elected. Nevertheless, the new "independents" like Cox are trying to get the TV hearings called off. Whether by pleading for the rights of individual men who may still be "inmates", or by pleading high senility about "new world relations" and "national security", the result is one more cop-out.

"National security"? Who cares about the fate of a dead president? in the murder of Nino Cimino? For ordering the bungling of Dr. Elling's psychiatry's office? For indicting Hickenlooper's creation, a new Mississippi Avenue image of Nixon -- a totally new, unrecognizable for instance, called "The Presidency", and fully enveloped in "Executive Privilege"? All in a hope to have Nixon sound more learned and self-persuaded than the Nixon called Adlai Stevenson the "speaker who got a Ph.D. from Dene Adames's College of Cruelty Communist containment", and rammed about "the Truman-Acheson-Stevenson pact's defense of Communism in high places"?

Though these quotations from Nixon's past are not now heard from the TV label, Nixon fears that his 25-year-police-pension career as "master spy catchers" would reveal his start is politics back in 1966 when he first set the law standard both of slander and excessive rigidity.

THE CONTINUOUS LINE--1946 to 1973

After all, there is a most continuous line from 1946 when he accused Congressman Voorhees of accepting money from the "Communist Political Action Committee of GIO"; through the 1962 dummy committee to set up to collect money for "Democrats" who opposed the duly-nominated Governor Pat Brown; to the "handcuffed" money for his 1972 election campaign. Nixon's position seems to be that "campaign bonds" are not entitled to know his world now that he has become so great a "statesman" that he opened doors to China despite his 20 years of strenuous labor to keep them closed on the ground that it would change the "Communist appearance" would wish them opened.

Where the 1962 press dealt slick backed and Nixon beat the election, the same (H. R. Haldeman) whose backstitch he was, went all the way up to the White House in 1972 when his backstitch was an election of Nixon.

The $100,000 sunk into "committee for Democrats" in 1962 is nothing as compared to the 1972 money, "handcuffed" and otherwise, that went unreported, though most willingly given by corporations from ITT to Vastex. (He had considered the $200,000 he gave the Nixon campaign small potatoes compared to the $204 million he milked out of a multinationals company he headed and didn't wish the Securities and Exchange Commission to investigate.)

One single fact does already stand out: TV hearings have completed quite a change in the stance of Nixon. In August, 1972, the globally presaged Nixon (allegedly too busy with matters of state and world "responsibilities") to say anything to such a lovely pre-packaged as his election for "four more years") maintained that none in the White House was "involved in any of the very bizarre incident". April 20 of this year, when he had to admit some "personal wrongdoing" in the part of his staff, he was still laboring the public that they must understand how highly extolled these individuals were. By May 23 he not only had to point to others "swindling", but himself admit to setting the "climate" for "oversensitivity". The one single word of truth is "clumsy".

(Continued on Page 5)

"Why they had to forge documents when it would have been so much easier to get "proof" from the notorious Mme. Ha"

(redacted)
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Politics of Counter-revolution: Watergate and the 'Year of Europe'

(Continued from Page 1)

That one single word of truth—the "climate" Nixon created—was, however, by no means limited to the year, 1973. Rather, the criminality in Nixon's created "climate" of political correctness that was initiated with his first election in 1968. Nixon's re-election in 1972 solidified the climate and made it more public. Watc...
harrow—a very small, "battlefield" nuclear weapon. It is to be incarcerated into European defenses. Lord Chaloner—no revolutionary he—described this technologically viable weapon as an idea that is "misconceived, logically indefensible, and almost criminally dangerous."

His article from the London Times was reproduced in the Toronto Globe and Mail on May 10. I have seen no reference to this Nixon-Kissinger-Pentagon inventiveness in our daily press. Yet it is this weapon which should be shifted to the center stage of "the Year of Europe." Here is what Lord Chaloner wrote:

"What is misleading is to suggest that in doing so (in selling off the very small, extremely precise nuclear weapons), it is possible to separate nuclear blast from radiation. The miniature nuclear weapon is technologically feasible, the elegant, "clean" battlefield nuclear weapon is pure Strategic fantasy.

Whether or not that will buy Nixon "a new Atlantic charter," there is no doubt about the following: As opposed to West Europe is to Nixon-Kissinger's attempt to blackmail it into granting trade advantages for American products in the Common Market, and helping it shore up the American dollar linked to a "common defense concept," the point is that America still is the consumer and industrial giant; that the economic crisis is in Europe (West and East) as well as in the U.S. West Europe is fearful of shaking the boat—world capitalism in crisis.

One can pick up any French newspaper and find that the government has yet to forget 1968. Whether or not they agree it was a near-revolution, all admit that nothing has been the same since. And that is exactly where the politician of counter-revolution was born.

And so does capitalism do politics, dirty or "clean."

At best, window dressing, contraband; it doesn't and can't solve them. Just as Congress will do all in its power to save Nixon from impeachment, so West Europe will devise something to let him save face, when autumn comes and Nixon goes to Europe.

The only way to move out of Vietnam is to uproot it heck, stick and barrel, including its "intelligentsia.

Thus far, this breed of intellectuals, like Irving Kristol, wait in the wings not only for those jobs, but to become the centers for Public Broadcasting System. There are other "opportunities." Nothing new about the "new" conservative. Academia has ever been part of the military-industrial complex, or what Marx long ago called "the price fighters for capitalism." It is not that which is new and worrisome to the left.

WHAT NOW?

What has brought the Movement to an impasse is the blindness to the need for a philosophy of liberation without which no revolution can succeed. Starting with the near-revolutions in 1968 in Europe, and the 1970 anti-Vietnam campaigns in the U.S., have done, only increases its desperation—and brings on new forms of fascism, the politics of counter-revolution without scruples by "slightly motivated intellectuals" and their very own academicians. The one thing that Watergate has accomplished is to show just how inseparable is the depth of corruption, when it is not just individual pockets, from the bankruptcy of thought, the true seal of bankruptcy of civilization.

Once we do not stop either at muddling or, concluding that "therefore" we need a "new" political party, the politics of counter-revolution will become the shock that will make us work not to new a relationship of theory to practice, philosophy to revolution, that two will never again be separated, and thus will a totally new foundation for truly human relations be laid.

June 1973
Women's liberation, in fact and in philosophy

You may not be limited to just making sandwiches, you may even be able to enter the arts, isn't that great. The trouble is that you're not changing society at its roots, at its exploitative, male-dominated roots. People who think it's enough to be for women's rights, to go out for any and all causes, and to keep away from a revolutionary organization, waste that they and women only exclude themselves from the most serious, vital work of reorganizing society, but cut themselves off from the working women, who are the source of the very theory they need.

WHAT WE'VE BEEN looking at in studying the first women's movement was what was happening objectively in the world, objectively in this country. When we come down to our own age we have to ask what was happening objectively again, last suddenly the quickening 60's, when the youth were supposed to be the "best generation" burst out into the revolt of the 60's...

In the 60's, we've once again, back to the Black Dimension. People laughed occasionally at Marxism and Revolution which had just been published, because I said the Operation Big Report of 1960 was on entirely new stage that was related to the new stage in the Workers' Council of Hungary, where they had got rid of capitalism but wanted to be free from Communistism, too, because it was just another form of state-capitalism. It became a world phenomenon, and a national phenomenon in 1960 when the black youth in Greensboro, North Carolina refused to move until they were served at the lunch-couters...

The white students who were supposed to be the heat generation went South—they thought they were going to do something for the civil rights movement of the Blacks. But when they got there they found that the Blacks who were asking them to set up schools had an idea of education that they had never dreamed of. Our education is theory-made, completely theoretical, designed to prepare those who will oppress others. But the Freedom Schools were asking totally different questions: they wanted an education as they could find...
out how to get rid of the Bull Connors too soon. The
while students suddenly realized that instead of helping
the blacks live social workers, they were lowering a
totally new dimension themselves. They came back
North and realized that it wasn't only the worker who
is alienated, but the comfortable, middle-class whites
giving a "great university" like Berkeley were just
numbers put into a computer.

IT WAS IN February of 1968, when L. B. Johnson
first raised the question of stand off, that, instead of having
either just a Civil Rights movement, or a Free Speech
movement, we suddenly had the birth of an entirely new
generation of revolutionaries who were questioning
everything in this society. The one thing, unfortunately,
they still didn't question was philosophy. They were all
very proud of their programs—but it didn't help them
too much.

It was at this point that the women began saying:
"Now this is strange. I'm part of this great movement,
and yet I'm counting the minutes instead of
writing the leaflets." Nobody could accuse them of
not being revolutionary. They were questioning whether
something wasn't wrong with a movement that supposed-
ly believed in a new society and yet practiced the same
division of labor as the one we live in. Not only that,
Nob everybody could accuse them of being against blacks. But
when it came to the women question, there was nobody
Chomsky describing "the only position for women is
protest." The women's question brought us to an
entirely new stage.

We were moving to the high point of 1968, and it
was a high-point internationally. In this country the
anti-Vietnam war movement was still growing. And for
the first time in an advanced country like France we
had a near-revolution. It started as a student movement,
but they suddenly realized why Marx said the proletariat
was the force for revolution. When you have 10,000
students in Paris on strike it looks very great, but if
you have 10 million workers getting down their tools
and stopping production, it is a very different situation.

WHY DID WE get only a near-revolution out of all
this? Those who were concerned with where the philo-
sophy was, were likely to be told, whatever by Mario
Savio or Cobo-Satch, "We will pick it up on route.
"All they picked up was an aborted revolution.

EGD wound up in completely mindless activities.
The women who had just begun the Women's Liberation
movement wound up "following their men" in all of
the splits and factions. But it isn't quite true that they
were just following their men. It was worse. They voted for
the same resolutions the men voted for. That is what
they really believed.

In a word, once you do not have a total philosophy
of liberation, once you do not see that the dialectics
of liberation are forces and reason, then there is no place
to go but the so-called male-dominated, pragmatic,
revolutionary groups that thought they could pick up
philosophy "on route."

We have to realize that even though we have an
independent movement, even though we are not in
isolation from the men or from the children, for that
matter; even though we are not isolated from the other
movements, it takes a great deal more than just activity.
It takes the kind of unity of objectives and substantive
where you suddenly see that you cannot have a suc-
cessful revolution without having the underlying phi-
sophy that is the liberation of humanity.

City-Sept 1973
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ECONOMICS PHASE-OUT, GLOBAL POLITICS PHASE-IN

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of Marxism and Freedom
and Philosophy and Revolution

(EDITOR'S NOTE: We print below excerpts from one section of the "Draft Perspectives Report" prepared for the Commission of News & Letters Committees. Copies of the complete report are available for $5 from News & Letters, 1600 E. Jefferson, Detroit, Mich. 48207.)

Phase 4 should have been entitled "How to Bring on a Recession." Like the planned unemployment when the Nixon administration first fanned unemployment and the falling profit rate it was determined to stop upward, it has now removed price controls so that uncontrollable inflation can go hog wild. Among other things, this forces the poorly-witted blocks to face the very question of survival altogether, the more workers to spend more, and even the middle class to save and borrow less, not to mention the slowdown in production.

Does Nixon expect us to suffer a total loss of memory when, in line to the state-capitalist phase 2, his Economic Report read: "By the end of 1973, American anti-inflation policy had become the marvel of the rest of the world ... largely because of this change, the rest of the world is willing to hold increasing amounts of dollars? Since then, the dollar has had to be devalued twice; wholesale prices rose 25 percent annually, profits and food costs skyrocketed and unemployment remained at an "average" of 5 percent, though it was actually over 8 percent in industrial cities, and twice that amount among blacks, especially youth. Now rush to individual enterprises and uncontrolled multinational corporations and you are assured that the booming profits will last as long as 1974. Already we have a considerable lowering of production and no hold on wild inflation.

AGAINST THE labor bureaucracy that was playing around with management over "in and out" and still continues to do so, the present rulers broke out into wildscreeching, first and above all, over the inhuman conditions of labor, and secondly, for a decent wage to stop running a continuous losing race against runaway inflation. The very UAW bureaucracy, its class-collaboration did not stop even at the point of offering to those who were the "radicals" at Chrysler, to the whole big dog to the class enemy when it called upon the police to eject workers from the factory, the factory they occupied — bad, at the same time, to admit the unique conditions that would now have to be given a high priority rating.

Whatever covers-up the labor bureaucracy will desire for its class-collaboration and its sure bet to contract-making time, nothing can hide the fact that it is the prop for the whole capitalist system. The salary of Watergate may not be on them, but that is only because Nixon never liked them that high up. The point is that the lying, frontal style of the President characterizes the labor bureaucracy as well. They are indeed the last barrier to labor's control over its working conditions. But it is clearer to see the profound corruption inherent in patriotism as the last refuge of the scoundrel in the Watergate Hearings.

THE ANALYSIS of Watergate has already been dealt with in: "The Politics of Counter-Revolution: Watergate and the 'Year of Europe.'" (News & Letters, June-July, 1973). The "Year of Europe," with its profound corruption, endless flow of money, empty lies, bugging of the Oval Office so that anyone who entered that inner sanctum was unknowingly and with motives afterthought roped, clearly put the "Year of Europe" in the shade. It will not end when the Watergate Hearings end. It will remain confusing sure with its ambience over international as well as national developments ... .

The latest technological horror in the global "per- spectives" (1) is the "battlefield nuclear weapon" the U.S. wishes to impose on Europe, specifically West Ger- many. Such a step is of fighting! Such a step is of fighting is what Dr.strength Khrushchev has the gag to call "the philosophical underpinnings of a common de- fense concept." On the more immediate front, Nixon wishes this "common defense concept." Real in the trade advantages he wants from the Common Market. Nevertheless, so great is the nuclear and economic might of U.S. imperialism, so fearful are the Europe-clinging classes of "repulsion of 1972," that, indeed, West Germany's fear of and Western Europe's relationship to Faust Americans, the international Monetary Fund has helped shore up the dollar; the devastations have made U.S. goods so attractive abroad that this has gained a surplus in foreign trade. No decade since the 1920s, though, 1930s, "summit" will be convened to allow for a "new phase" that can be passed off for a "new Atlantic Pact" before the "Year of Europe" ends.

Or will they "move" 1974 into 1975 to continue with France's decision that she is "middlemen," that is, not only U.S.-Russia are embarking upon her benefit, but West Germany is definitely not bowing to the lesser- economic power? Where is the superpowers face to face, all, it is China, not Western Europe of Japan who is heard. Though she is in every way in a fix a crisis, it is not only "to the long run" that must now discard 600 million human beings. At this very moment she holds the sea in Cambodia which means the whole Far East and the "presence" of both the U.S. and North Vietnam.

WHERE IS OR NOT the "Nixon Doctrine" of mak- ing Aden, Chah Asia continues to operate in Southeast Aisa depends not so much on U.S. might as on the Chin- ese conflict, thus the Prince who cast his eyes aside when his own country was first bombed, and now labors to make sure there will be no other attacks on his China's peninsulas. Put more concretely, Stalinism is a...
New introduction distorts Marx's 'Grundrisse'

NOVEMBER, 1973

BY RAYA DUGANOVSKAYA
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

(Editor's Note: PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION, by Raya Dunayevskaya, deals extensively with Marx's 1857-58 Notebooks, now world-famous as the GRUNDRISE, or Chapter Notes: "A New Consensus of Thought: Marx's Historical Materialism and its Inseparability from the Hegelian Dialectic." At the time PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION went to press, however, the GRUNDRISE had not yet appeared in an English translation. So fantastically did she consider the introduction written by Martin Nicolaus, when it did appear, that Raya Dunayevskaya wrote an inscrutable letter to it, from which I print brief excerpts below. The full letter can be obtained for $2.00 from News & Letters, 555 2nd Avenue, New York, New York.)

Grundrisse has finally been translated into English and published in full. Unfortunately, this edition is har- 
coured by so fantastic a foreword by its translator, Martin Nicolaus, that we must all go over again from Marx to his interpreters.

By stating that this foreword is 'fantastic' I do not mean it departs in any fundamental way from estab- 
lished Marxism, which, with reformists, has damned 
the removal of the Hegelian dialectic semblances 
of Marx's works. And I certainly do not mean that 
"orthodoxy" raised with phobia who threw out the nega-
tion of the negation" from the "dialectical laws", much 
less with Marx who converted contradiction from the 
elemental class struggle to "principles" and "subordinating 
forces changing places in a shoe of four classes." (The 
latter two, especially Marx, get praised to the skies, so 
that we need that the Contradictions and on Practice is 
at one and the same time strictly enshrined in the Marx- 
ian terms and highly original." (p. 41, fn. 59). I mean that 
the pull of pragmatics, state-capitalism, and the admin-
istrative mentality that characterizes our age are so 
overwhelming that all the years put into the translation, 
the recognition that "The Grundrisse challenges and puts 
into the test every serious interpretation of Marx yet con-
ceived." (p. 41) and the substantive wish to be revolution-
ary, are still no shield from the objective pull of our 
state-capitalist epoch and the miasma of the times. Marx 
and his translators are not close to the ground so that you hear all the dialectical voices from precise sensing with the self-determination of the philo-

From the very first page, first paragraph, Nicolaus announces that the 1857-58 Notebooks "display the key elements in Marx's development and overview of the Hegelian philosophy." (p. 47, my emphasis.) With this as his ground, how could the translator possibly learn anything from the 1857-58 Notebooks? ...

THE NEXT 35 pages of this Foreword Nicolaus de-
votes to background plus a few pages in trying to sum-
maries the first chapter of Marx's On Money and into the 
first section of Capital. All in defense of the translator's 
toordination of the argument" (p. 32) or only to 
conclude: "All that follows in the remaining 400 pp. of 
the Grundrisse is built on the basic elements here out-
lined.

Having thus cavalierly virtually dismissed one-half of 
the book (he will later return in bits and pieces), he 
is off on his own. I am here, then, that we have to search 
for his method and aim and originally of contribution. 
Quoting Marx in the difference between a method of 
transformation and a method of influence, which Nicolaus 
translates as "method of working", Nicolaus concludes 
that this is the unique feature of the Grundrisse. Direct-
ly after this he uses Marx's term to quote Marx, this time Marx's 
letter to Engels (Jan. 14, 1880) on the fact that Marx 
did indeed force Hegel's Logic of great service "in the 
method of working." Unfortunately, Nicolaus has no 
comprehension whatever, either of this sentence or the 
area he quotes from Lenin that it was "impossible com-
pletely to understand Marx's Capital, especially Chap-
ter One, we have to have historically dialectical in the 
Logic of Hegel's Logic." Far from being himself on either, 
Nicolaus is on his way to construct something altogether 
different. ... While this line in the face of Marx's critique of 
the dialectic as rooted in history, self-development, the 
self-making of labor, Nicolaus stresses how "undeniable 
contrary to Hegel's method" is Marx's. (Nicolaus here 
limits himself to the concreteness of Marx's concept of 
thesis, especially on the question of productivity, which is, 
of course, crucial, but we will see later that what he 
leaves out, in turn, is the whole of Marxism: SUBJECTIVITY, 
self-development, means as reason and not just as labor 
force.) ...

AT THE MOMENT Nicolaus was altogether too busy 
not denying Hegel: "The historical point of his philosophy was 
that he denied the reality of what the senses perceive." (p. 35). Not a word about the fact, according to 
Marx, so great was Hegel's discovery of second nega-
itivity, and so rooted in the revolutionary period, to 
Hegel had in "overthrowing the reality of reality" over that reality. It is of course in reality where Marx's point 
and so did the historic period of 1848 as against 1789 
but, again, it was the Subject, the material that made the Great Divide between Hegel, the bourgeois 
(Continued on Page 7)
(Continued from Page 5)

philosopher, and Marx who had discovered a new continent of thought that was not merely materialism vs. idealism but the unity of the two in "the new humanism," and that carried through into Vol. III of Capital as "Human power is its own end."

So preoccupied is Nietzsche with contrasting

M. Marx's 'Grundrisse'

cruxial Chapter One of Capital, which (1) Lenin called attention to as requiring the whole of Leopold's but which

Nicolson reduces to zero stating "it would be a misreading of Lenin's intent to argue that ... This is a project for a long term in print." (p.61). (2) He never once

expresses himself as to that constant reappearance of Chapter One at each revolutionary period and counter-revolutionary demanding it be driven out of the thralled

wage labour, as Stalin did in 1923. Moreover, and above all, (3) what exactly is Chapter One, and its 1923-25 re-writing by Marx himself of final section "Feudalism of

Commodity," and why did Marx set readers at the German edition which did not have that essential part to please read the French edition following the Paris Commune?

Nothing, nothing whatever, is greater proof of the revolution of the dialectic on the basis of this elemental

materializing and the self-development of Marx's Repi of

Commodity. In "nothing whatever" I include all the

great dialectical development in Grundrisse, even its He

billion-Marxian "absolute movement of becoming." For

the most natures, most creative geniuses learned from the

Feudal men that that person, form a commodity, the use

form of a product of labor, can never be stripped of its

feudalism except by "freely associated labor." As

his beginning, as against Hegel's in Science of Logic,

was not only concrete, tangible as against abstract uni-

versal of Being, but it was also the soil-concrete, con-

crete form of production versus market equality, but that Abst.

Buber, the specifically capitalist state of production,

wherein land had to be split into two, bourgeoisie relica-

tion vs. freely associated labor showing it is all rela-

tions of production that must be uprooted and recreated

on altogether different foundations.

THE NEW IN the Grundrisse even now is not merely

"method of working," great as that is. It is the con-

stituents of the constancy of the material and Hegelian di-

rectly. From the moment of break with bourgeois society

1845, all the way through Grundrisse and total break with

vulgar materialism, (that merely as subjectivism or pro-

duce, that is to say liberation to capital and the First

International, Marx's self-development is in no sense a

break from the young Marx that discovered a new con-

tent of thought.

Any who question, as Nicolson does, whether "it is

negligible necessary to read Hegel's Logic in order to

completely understand Capital" when Grundrisse is fi-

nally available; and then claim that Grundrisse is just

"to see a mind at work, are indeed the worst kind of

serious-minded "ideological." They are completely dead to

the whole of the past two decades when theoretical,

from the East German Revolt in 1952 to Paris and

Peking, 1960, as well as from above (self-determination

of idea finally catching up with self-determination of
technical and new forms) have arisen. This

movement surely has passed by progress of the

States. Marx, not to mention the transcendentalism and all

who thought they can catch theory "en route." The

task for us, however, has just begun.

Raya Dunayevskaya

July 1, 1978
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THE MIDDLE EAST ERUPTS

By Ray Dunning

National Chairman, News & Letters Consultants

(Editors’ Note: As we go to press, the two superpowers have remonstrated the Middle East conflict, allegedly to gain a “cease-fire” which has not stopped the fighting. The world developments have renewed interest in the fundamental analysis written on October 15 by Ray Dunning, which we print below.)

Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Dayan on Oct. 8 pronounced the latest imperialist statement: “The same road that leads from Damascus to Tel Aviv also leads from Tel Aviv to Damascus.” To try to defend such reactionary militarist statements by pointing to the fact that it was not Israel, but Egypt and Syria who first crossed the 1967 cease-fire boundaries, is to fall into the typical capitalist/Communist trap about “aggravation.”

It is a clear question of who fired the first shot. Israel had six years during which she had not returned as much as one inch of Arab soil.

Not only had she behaved as any imperialist—occupying territory that was not hers, expelling people whose land it was, and proceeding to remake it in her image both as to land and as to settlers. Therefore, to keep hanging on the timing of the surprise attack, blase-phemous or otherwise, is to talk in a language that is absolutely foreign to the masses who are doing the dying, Israel as well as Arab.

This is not a matter of “approval” of either Arab or Israeli rulers. This war, Nor can the question possibly be limited to the two sides, in disregard of the superpowers—U.S. and Russia—who have been in the Middle East not one even since 1967. THE BIG POWERS ARE LINING UP

Take Kissinger’s frightening statement: “We shall remain engaged in the Middle East to ensure that responsibility in any case, including the Middle East.”

For the sake of Israel, Secretary of State Kissinger then inimical impression that he was threatening Russia. In fact, he denied being involved in the second line: “(Oct. 15th) press conference, he was also saying the opposite—that Russia is a “responsible” power and “western” as the U.S. in the Middle East.

What is all this add up to in the U.S., like Kissinger, has no intention of letting either the Israelis or the Arabs egos. (Fortune, Oct. 3) press conference, he was also saying the opposite—that Russia is a “responsible” power and “western” as the U.S. in the Middle East.

Just as the Magin Line failed to protect France, the Bar Lev Line failed to protect Israel. In both cases it was a question of militaries believing in technology rather than in people. The Magin Line was not outflanked; the Egyptians are reoccupying their own land. Equally, Israel, despite Kissinger’s threat is not the decisive factor. The Arabs in Israel-occupied territory must look to the Egyptians as liberators who they wish would come closer. That fact cannot be changed even if Israel mounts a counter-offensive and wins.

The oil against the 1967 Arab war体贴 which showed its unmistakable anti-Semitic splinter with its domination of “driving Israel into the sea.” The present United Nations is too insignificant to be regarded as doing anything which the General Assembly’s resolution of 1967 did not make it clear that it is Israel’s right to establish its right to occupy lands. Whatever he was “unanimously,” it comes after last year’s display of willingness to open the Suez Canal to international traffic, including that of Israel. It was Premier Golda Meir who hadbid- her self and would not budge.

Presently, she is trying to shift the eyes of the Jews (Israeli and Russian) toward Soviet Russia. We are fighting for the Egyptian, Syrian army, not the rockets, the tanks, the planes—everything that is in the hands of the Egyptians and Syrians—this comes to us from the Soviet Union.

It is true that the arms are Russian, even as it is true that Israel’s are U.S.-made; exactly what Third World country produces tanks and missiles and planes? It is not true that the Arabs are fighting Russia’s war; they are fighting Israel’s imperialism. What is true, above all, is that in the entire quarter century of Israel’s existence, she has done nothing to solve the question of the Palestinian refugees.

ISRAEL: WHAT IT WAS; WHAT IT IS

What has happened to the humanity, the greatness, the daring of the Jews who occupied Palestine and fought the British imperialism so successfully that they inspired Narrer?

There is no doubt that a new direction emerged with the creation, in 1948, of the state of Israel in the Middle East, whose politics hereafter had been dominated by all. Although the fact is now conventionally forgotten, it was the anti-imperialist struggle of the Palestinian Jews that overwhelmed the young, then ill-known, Colonel Nasser, who had come to sign the pact ending the Arab-Israel war. That, instead of dealing with the Arab League, he was firing the Jews with questions as to just how the outcome, outmatched force could overcome British occupation, and Nasser did, instead, ally the masses he learned from the Jews, as he himself tells it in his “Philosophy of Revolution.”

What has happened to the Jewish revolutionaries who were during their World War II years also trying to establish solidarity with the Arab masses who would fight for freedom from imperialism? To point to the reactionary regime in the Middle East, their monopolies and monopolization, cannot possibly substitute for Israeli injustices to the Palestinian masses who know no other life than that of reliance.

OIL, AGAIN AND AGAIN AGAIN

In the Middle East, oil is “the oldest profession.” It has always been a compromising practice which helped feudal monoculture, shiekdoms and empires in power, the masses in poverty and illiteracy, the countries underdeveloped. With state capitalism as the dominant feature of world economy, oil has assumed a still more forceful metamorphosis as well as “radioactive” have learned all about nationalization, price gouging, and using their American counter-parts to put pressure on U.S. importations to fill policy toward the Arab oil monopolies rather than Israel.

This is volatile enough, but what is one to say when this late in the century we are confronted, at one and the same time, with a call from the rightest William F. Buckley, Jr., for re-consolidation, and from a former liberal, Walter Lippmann, with a statement that “a Western military presence” is a present need.

Here is what Buckley wrote before the Middle East erupted: “Domestically, where as only the nations of Western Europe should make a preemptive moral strike against hardening Arab oil policy, they would have the nature of saying: ‘Michael all must be made available.’ (Pulled in New York Post, 10/7/75.)

The liberals may not have the gall of a Buckley, who churlish celebration “a preemptive moral strike.” But one and all are now backing the U.S. need for a retaliated fire in the Middle East, and expressing the idea that Israel could become that supreme weapon not only against the oil powers but also against the nuclear powers, Russians.

6913 (unett-ec)
MAO'S CHINA AND THE THIRD WORLD

Along with the terrorists (and outright fascists like Aḥmad Kāmil whom Māo's Chīnā sheltered in the 1967 war), Chīnā prides herself on never having recognized Israel's right to existence. Never mind that the People's Republic of China didn't exist in 1967 or, more seriously, that even Stalin (to whom Māo bowed and fell down) was the very first to recognize the reborn state of Isrā'il. Never mind that "Marxism-Leninism" that Māo claims to espouse is supposed to stand for social revolution rather than individual terror, much less kingdoms or abdinations. All that we are supposed to see is that Russia is "Enemy Number One," and all else is subordinated to that single overpowering "fact.

On this, Gōdō Makī and Māo are one. In this, though on opposite sides of the Brīng Ro, and though one (526) claims to be the spokesman for the Third World, those two are the only rulers who seem not to shy away from any consequences of their policies, even where that might lead to a nuclear holocaust.

The possibility of World War Three is by no means excluded. The looking for position is not only among the warring powers but among the nuclear super-powers. The Middle East war is by no means over yet, either as between the countries at war or the super-powers lining up behind each door, much less within each country.

WHERE TO NOW?

Where the 1967 war, with its anti-Semitism and settler-colonialism, ended-the only area where violence within Israel, this war can open new ways out if it can lead a new bureaucrat of reality across national boundaries. This is the only area where revolutions outside of Israel can take part.

The "New Left" which thinks being against Israel in turn proves them to be "real" revolutionaries aligning with the Third World, and that the Third World as it now exists means a new world social order, are creating nothing but delusions. No revolutionary regimes exist in Jordan; nor is Māo's Chīnā the equivalent of socialism.

Quite the contrary. All that such false identification shows is its insignificance cannot think of liberation without holding onto existing state powers—rulers who strike out against their own masses.

All one has to do is see that is to look at recent events: King Hussein's massacre of the Palestinian rebels; Māo's turning against his own "ultra left" youth because they followed the Cultural Revolution's slogan, "it is right to rebel.

For that matter, the "Left" in Israel, who thought the way to oppose their rulers was to become spies for Syria, demonstrate that they have no conception of the fact that the struggle for liberation within one's country is not, and cannot be, turned over to an outside state power. Which does not mean that the Israel Left has no ongoing war.

This war is one too many for both sides in the Middle East conflict. For the situation to have moved off from dead end only to erupt into a full scale war of global proportions. That is to say, the two superpowers of both the Arab and the Israeli peoples. All the more that the final answer will only come from revolutions within each country, and that includes a revolution in Israel.

In the U.S., the "Year of Europe" has become a year of instability, has become the year of counter-revolution in Chīnā has become the year of the Middle East. Both call it "the way ahead means it. Neither the "boxed" war nor is it the United States; will have the last say. The Big Powers, but themselves to do the deciding—not even such middle a tilting toward the oil monopolists.

The point is that for revolutionaries, there can be no simplistic answers. That they are no substitute for seriously working out a method of struggle insurmountable from a philosophy of liberation, all integrated to masses in motion. There simply is no substitute for a social revolution within each country.

Oct. 3, 1973

[Date stamped: Nov. 1973]
THE U.S., A GLOBAL POLITICS AND THE MID EAST WAR

by Kaye Dunnevack

National Chairman of Women’s News & Letters Committees

At prime time, on Nov. 25, the President took to the airwaves to tell us about the energy crisis. As if reducing house and office temperatures to 65 degrees and auto speed to 55 miles an hour would solve the crisis which caused him to create still one more bureaucracy, the Energy Emergency Action Group, the U.S. was confident but distraught Mr. Nixon unflooded another fairy tale by the end of the decade the U.S. would be to totally self-sufficient in energy that we would be independent of any other land, the Middle East— or whatever.

The bidding of the bid for the 1980s bid from us that this Administration is doing nothing whatever “to discipline” the oil monopolies, although it is they who are neither producing enough oil nor in anyway “distributing” the oil kingdoms, sheikdoms and emirates who are so totally dependent on the know-how and technology of “the seven sisters” (BP, Shell, Chevron, Texaco, Gulf and Mobil)

WHAT NIXON DIDN’T TELL US

That was not all that we did not hear about in Nixon’s hurried 15-minute address. Not one word was uttered about the Middle East war and the total disorder this has caused among the West European powers plus Japan—all U.S. allies.

The self-made policy is practiced not because they have much interest in either side of the Arab-Israeli war, but because the question of oil is as potent a weapon and instrument of political policy as ever was Munich.

Most deceptive of all was the silence about the one simple and overriding truth that faces us: a recession, a deep one. No serious commentator now denies that unemployment, far from receding, will reach unsatisfactory levels by 1974. The most conservative, most even handed, most realistic of the President’s speeches thus far were often eight percent—and that never fails to mean that for blacks it will be 12 percent.

To get the depth of the crisis we have to turn away from Nixon’s shallow talk about no fighting for the sake of the world’s prosperous middle class and turn to the ambitious and poetic The New Anti-Russian Stance.

The Secretary of Defense,核武器的可使用性“peace tour” through the Middle East ended in, of all places, Peking, and Nov. 14, addressed a totally new set of relations. To the surprise even of Kissinger, he was presented that morning with a cable from the Joint Communist with Nixon in 1972. In place of the 1972 communiqué making Taiwan the special case question asserting “normalization” between China and the U.S. the 1972 paragraph limited itself to affirming “the principle of one China.”

Even before the moment, on Nov. 11, when Cheu greeted Kissinger as the “Middle East,” it was clear that the Middle East had brought U.S.-China relations to a sort of joint air war. For one thing, China had not used its veto power against the U.S. Senate sponsored non-nuclear resolution in the Middle East. Secondly, and crucially, it was not Russia’s sponsorship of one that kept China from using its veto power. Rather, it was China’s perception of the new anti-Russin stance.

When Russia threatened to enter the Middle East Imbroglio, America called a world alert. As against West Europe, the U.S. did not order air space, China declared that the U.S. had to do so “to forestall the Soviet Union from sending troops unilaterally to the Middle East.” As the China News Agency put it, it was not only because Russia understood that the U.S. “really meant business” it backed down.

China has been preoccupied—its own national interests which held that Russia is “nearby no. 1.” Because that is so, it quickly forgot that it was “totally” for the Arab side, up to and including “moving Israel into the sea.” No sooner did the Middle East war look as if it might have a new Russia-U.S. confrontation that China moved for a global position for itself with the U.S. This, but was not the first time China moved for a rapprochement with the U.S. on a major conflict issue and trade and cultural relations.

First, it helped take the U.S. off the hot seat in Indochina. Then, during the SALT talks (which it stymied) it nevertheless began easing West Europe and to oppose a “U.S. presence.” In the Middle East it was even more intensely interested in preventing a “U.S. presence.” China too well understands the U.S. nuclear power that the U.S. has.

The only one who didn’t understand what was involved in the Middle East cried as it edged toward an East-West confrontation or didn’t care to face its global implications—was West Europe. It was neither willing to sacrifice its national interests as they were bound to Arab oil, nor was it willing, as the West European press put it, to risk “nuclear annihilation without representation.” And it was a great deal easier for the U.S. than for Russia.

DECEMBER, 1973

THE YEAR OF EUROPE THAT WASN’T

Not only did Nixon-Kissinger’s “Year of Europe” never come to be. But the inter-imperialist rivalry between West Europe and the U.S. split open at all stages, and not only over the Middle East war which brought it all to a climax. Rather, it is evident even in the “philosophical understandings” of globalization.

During the critical two weeks, between the U.S. and Europe, a U.S. world split on Oct. 25 and Nov. 8 (when Kissinger departed for the Middle East) from 10 will state the regime of the State and Defense Departments, and the White House itself were edited. At first, West Europe reducing the new tension to an economic level: “Europe which gets 60 percent of its oil from the Middle East would have frozen to death unless there had been a dollar shortage.”

Then Kissinger, the “architect” of the “Year of Europe” exploded: “What concerns us is that for two weeks, while the U.S. made significant decisions, the Europeans acted as though NATO did not exist.” The Europeans seemed more interested in gaining marginal advantage. I don’t care what happens to NATO I’m so digressed.

The Europeans, angered both at Nixon’s material vulgarity and the Defense and State Department’s arrogance of nuclear steering without consultation, let it be known that European and U.S. interests were not the same in the Middle East. “It’s Dubluinhan hypocrisy on the part of Dr. Kissinger to pretend that they are.” West Europe, at one and the same time, tried to read agreement in the Middle East which “was never a part of NATO’s origin or purpose,” and expeditious to the Middle East stance to an anti-U.S. one, holding that Washington was bargaining over the edge of “strategic Implications.”

NIXON-KISSINGER’S VISION: Pax Americana

But the anti-U.S. unity did not succeed in forging a common stand as to itself. The Europeans were united in taking a pro-Arab position but not a pro-Europe stand. They rejected, for example, the Dutch minister that they “share all within the Common Market community.”

As against those West European rulers who, since they have no place to go, do not know how to get there,
Nixon-Kissinger have a "whale"? Few Americans, hence, they feel compelled to the need, because, of all, for a "con- corporal" sake. More realistically put, Nixon-Kissinger's coup-daill" as they say so that "if the U.S. was on the "edge of hysteria", it was not over Israel or the "Yale"-porer on which not one agitation at hand-but over a possible nuclear detonation with the other nuclear arms, Russia, over whom will rule the world. Not only is "the Year of Europe" the year that wasn't. But "the new Atlantic charter" that is evolving is the absolute opposite of what Nixon-Kissinger called for.

Even when temper cooled considerably, Le Monde declared U.S. authorities, basing their action on "the cold war" that had already been determined, were in truth showing that it was not for European defense that it was absolutely necessary to keep U.S. troops in Europe; but "for America's own security.

In a word, the simple Kissinger truth is that, far from the Knesset lobby or Arab oil being the mainstay of the present confrontation, it is "U.S. presence" versus Russian that is pivotal, that overrides all other questions, that has won China, had neutralized the Arab world, gotten concessions from Israel, and is the question that has put a question mark over the very existence of NAK.

Of course, it isn't only West Europe that "doesn't understand." Neither does Kissinger's own assistant, the specialist on the Middle East in the State Department.

So, why are his Kissinger's 48-hour miracle of getting Sadat to sign the six-point "peace plan" that he declared that he was "convinced that Congress would rise to the occasion"? The reason is the mood is changing in the U.S. administration and, according to Kissinger's sources, in the White House, towards a conciliatory strategy. Kissinger, his boss.

THE NEW ROLE OF SADAT'S EGYPT AND "THE LEFT"

There is no doubt that there has been a shift in the Middle East, perspective and that there are no longer real concessions from Israel and therefore can appear to have a role not on the "right" but on the "left". But what is of the greatest importance—and indeed, is the overriding aim of Nixon-Kissinger—is Russia not only the Middle East.

That was the trump card to be used to get the Arabs to sign the six-point "peace plan" that he hoped to get Sadat's signature to stabilize Israel. Though the Sadat-Allah coup was not being used as the political weapon to exact high prices AND to separate out Egypt from the U.S.-sponsored alliance, he himself fears "to become sufficiently backed up in the Khash". Thus, it may happen that Nixon-Kissinger, Nixon took steps to appease Kissinger, to play down any accusations and play up "inter- ests of the United States and its allies.

On the other hand, there were some demonstrations in Europe against their "whale"-mouthing so easily to the demands of all for multi-state status—"Are we going to win another world?" On the other hand, in the massive hand, however, the Left, in its correct stand against Israeli's occupation of all the Arab lands and the threat of the Palestinian refugees, is acting as if Arab oil equals "revolution."

The truth is that the reason Sadat's Egypt achieved "Arab unity" is in the use of oil as political weapon is not due to him being a revolutionary, as is often said.

Nasser's Egypt never could get the oil kingdoms to use their resources as a political weapon against "the West." (which suddenly now includes Japan), because they feared him as a revolutionary nationalist who stood apart from Egypt's leaders. As against that, the oil kingdoms have total confidence in Sadat who will not only do nothing to "interfere in internal affairs" but will also do all in his power to discourage revolutionary movements against any exploitative, reactionary feudal regime.

MIDDLE EAST AS KEY

What the Left refuses to face in this Egyptian victory is that, far from it being what Western imperialism calls "colonialism in reverse"—that means in the underdeveloped countriesReally killing off against imperialism, the simple truth is that neither "the West" nor only the oil kingdoms favor Sadat. What Sadat did achieve, in addition to Arab oil being used as a political weapon, is to let Nixon and Brezhnev know they cannot put the Middle East on the back burner forever.

As against not only Israel but also U.S.-Russia, Sadat's Egypt took the initiative in making secret plans for the attack, in choice of date, Yom Kippur and Yom Kippur, for that purpose in attack. The success of the crossing of Sinai into Israel was in small part due to the fact that it was a surprise. In any case, politically it was a total success and Brezhnev and Nixon rushed to the aid, not necessarily on the same side even where détente demanded it.

The new, the global new all in all is that, instead of the "Colonization" which Kissinger, the pro-cen- tered intellectual, thinks it is, the Middle East showed it can become the key to the world situation, as Germany was in World Wars I and II. So the "conceptual basis" of "Atlantic Alliance" being held in its basic keys, and perhaps for the last time.

The Left must not forget that its "conceptual basis" is the simple truth that the enemy is always on the border, with the cold war, to Israel, too, unfortunately, most of the Left, not only the moderate ones, in half back, in half back. It cannot be otherwise, as long as its own social revolution, not national, and truly independent of the U.S., Russia, China, or any other state power.

BACK HOME

Where Nixon thought the Middle East War would get in the Watergate hot seat and show him as the world statesman in full control of the global situation, the masses are so disgusted with the lies poured out of the White House that he's still thought the world alert but one more proof of Tricky Dick.

Whatever the power—and they are many, beginning with the tightening of their belts that are light enough already—there is everywhere a new search for something to replace Kissinger's "conceptual basis" and "philosophical underpinning" for Fox American. In the absence of a new thought, such as is the academic question, either the search for a new relationship of thought of what to think is the end episode is that of the end of all, none of whose direction is known, that is all are preparing for the worst. This does not mean that they will submit as the worst, but that they are working out new forms of opposition.
War and practicing war by other means

IT BECOMES INCUMBENT upon us to examine carefully the three new threats that have surfaced with the present state of world counter-revolution:

First, in Chile itself, with the brutal murder of Allende (the duly elected president with his Youth parliamentary majority), there has appeared a new pro-fascist "mass base"—the middle class, including the professionals, the businessmen, the right-wing clergy.

Never before has this type of base been that active, that organized, that "respectable," and that willing to be led by the old fascist "Fatherland and Liberty!," a military junta that began its "patriotic mission" by destroying the country's national patrimony, its whole history, being ransacked by the blood of its leaders extracted by the counter-revolutionary junta and continuing with the murder of thousands of workers.

Second, an abnormally corrupt is the Nixon Administration (and as the Vice-President on the take showed, their corruption is by no means only verbal) so that the FTA offer of a billion to stop Allende's election was far from being the lowest point reached by the Republican Party.

Rather, the key in American imperialism's straight- shot on Chile—the U.S. intervention in Chili is allied—was everywhere, from having the World Bank withhold credit from the Allende parliamentary government, to keeping money flowing freely into the junta planning that coup, etc.

Third, that which was so phenomenal, so historic, so sharp a 180-degree turnabout—Nixon's spectacular trip to China—is already in a thousand little pieces . . .

SO OVERWHELLED, HOWEVER, were both Congressmen and journalists by the "brilliance" of the Harvard professor, so great the "pique" in their own "democracy" that "a few men in Germany" has become Secretary of State, that none paid any attention to the truth that, in fact, they just voted for the most medioc-

It would indeed be foolishly to be deceived far, no doubt, the convinced apostle Kissinger let it be that it is that "brilliant professor" and not the dirty, ruthless politician and tyrant, President Nixon, who is setting foreign policy, Nixon, not Kissinger, sets policy, Cold War policies have become just "pique" ones . . .

Nixon, no doubt, has underestimated just how great is the opportunity that came his way with the sino- soviet conflict. For the other truth is that it was not as much the Nixon Doctrine that opened new doors. Rather, it was the new reality of power in a nuclear superpower world, where one of the few nuclear states is underest by China—with a Nuclear nuclear power—has a million human beings and a lot of Marxist victories. On top of it all, China has the longest-held history common border with its "enemy Number One," Russia. In a

word, this third "little" nuclear power sits astride both the borders of Russia it claims, and those of Southeast Asia that the U.S. has failed to conquer.

Thus did the "new world relations" arise from world realities and continue becoming the new form of sharp contradictions . . .

So much attention has been given to Kissinger's pre-
diction for studies of Mearsheimer's "counter of Europe" and "balance of powers" strategy that hardly any time was left to the study he was promoting. I'm referring, of course, to the study that, called Dr. Sargent's Kissinger both Converse's infamous saying that "war is extension of politics by other means." In reverse, Nixon-Kissinger, the practitioners of never-ending wars, often practicing politics as an extension of war by other means, it is no at home, and abroad with friends and enemies; in New York, it has become a way of life.
ONLY MINERS' CONTROL OF SAFETY WILL REDUCE DEATHS

"Every single day that you go into that mine, you never know if you're going to come out alive or dead. Only you can't think about it. You'll go crazy if you do. You'd never be able to even go down there, let alone do any work."

As expressed by a West Virginia miner, and known by every coal miner in the nation, the overiding daily fact of life for them all is... death. It is this reality which, more than any other, shapes their values, philosophy and character.

It is a reality which they react to and have always fought against, as seen in their bitter battles during the "30s and 40s when they were desparately calling the "south troops of American labor" to their nine-month long strike in '43-'44 against saturation which first hit and devastated the coal mine industry and in which the miners responded by raising the all-inclusive historic question of "what kind of labor should man do as a human being?"

THROW OUT BOYLE

Their opposition to those who failed to respond seriously to their literal life and death needs was more recently shown in their decisive defeat of something United Mine Workers President Tony Boyle, replacing him with the relatively unknown Arnold Miller, who had campaigned as a platform of returning the union back to the miners. First and foremost in the minds of the miners, this means rescuing the mining industry from the unsafe conditions of work by insisting that violations of safety provisions will not be tolerated, and if they are that the violators be punished.

It has been a year since UMW President Miller was elected. To date, the miners appear to have given him pretty good marks, but they are not taking anything at face value.

"Miller has done some pretty good things about safety," said one Pennsylvania miner. "The union went to court here in this state to back up the rights of the miners who walked out because they felt their mines were unsafe. And we won the case in the lower court, but the operators took it to the Supreme Court, and they said that the men couldn't walk out until they had to go through the contract grievance procedures. Maybe those guys know something about law, but they sure don't know anything about the mines. You could be dead before you could file a grievance."

TAKING "WAIT AND SEE" ATTITUDE

But then he added, "Only there's less than that. Now we've got to wait and see what Miller does in contract talks. Then we'll be able to tell more."

This sentiment was expressed by other miners in West Virginia and Kentucky, with all eyes focused on the coming December, when the UMW contract with the coal operators expires. This was also high in the minds of delegates to the UMW convention held the first part of last December in Pittsburgh.

The fact that the convention was held in Pittsburgh indicated a change in itself. For the past 10 years, UMW conventions have been held outside of the coal region — in places like Miami, Atlantic City and even further away — to avoid the pressure of the rank-and-file miners. Miller obviously selected Pittsburgh to keep it in the heart of the coal region, open to the pressure of the rank-and-file.

While increased wages, a reduced work week, sick pay, vacation benefits and other fringe improvements were voted for, the Health and Welfare Fund was pointed to as the most important. It is this fund, into which coal operators now pay 20c per ton of union coal mined, that provides the money for hospital and medical care and retired miners' pensions.

HEALTH AND WELFARE FUND IS KEY

The reason is long-standing. When the United Mine Workers Fund was established in 1917, first financed by Ne a ton royalty, there were a ton, it provided not only full medical care for miners and their families plus a $200 month retirement benefit. It also paid for benefits, widows and survivors' benefits and medical care, plus the money to build and staff 1 hospitals in coal regions where there had never been anything approaching adequate medical care for workers in the most hazardous industry in the nation.

Following convention of the miners in the early '30s the fortunes of coal went down. From a work force of..."
WANT BENEFITS RESTORED

The miners want these benefits restored and improved, and make their feelings immediately known in any conversation on the point.

"Take my case," said a black miner in West Virginia, stopping every couple of sentences to spit up blood and smoke a tin can. "I was 52 years old and I'm already finished after putting in over 25 years in the mines. I've got Black Lung and have had two heart attacks and have got to watch everything I do just to stay alive. I haven't worked for a year and a half but the bills keep on coming in. Lately, I've started to get some Black Lung payments from the state, and that's what has been keeping me and my family going, plus my wife's working. But you've got to have more than that to live decently. Nobody should be allowed to be thrown on the scrap heap just because they can't work anymore because they're sick.

On the battle of the miners, there have been some changes — but many things remain the same, like the drive of the coal companies for coal regardless of what it costs in human lives.

"All the company and their bosses are interested in is that coal," another West Virginia miner declared. "It's that bad a mechanic electrocuted on the midnight shift. He was an afternoon shift mechanic, but had stayed in overtime to splice a cable to have the machine ready for the midnight shift when he got in, and had disconnected the electrical power from the machine. Now when a crew gets to the section, the boss is supposed to make a run of the section to make sure that everything is o.k., then get back to the men and tell them that everything's all right before they put power on the machines.

"But there's a big difference between what you're supposed to do and what is done. Power was put on that machine while the mechanic was still zapping the cable and killed him."

DANGERS PERSIST

He went on to detail various safety violations, like methane gas acuity on continuous mining machines that didn't work and exposed workers to deadly dangers of explosions; like defective water sprays on continuous mining machines, which add to the danger of Black Lung and create dust explosions that rip through mines with cloud-like action force that blasts steel railroad rails hush prone and shoves human bodies.

When asked if he could see any change since Miller had been elected President of the UMWA, he said, "I sure can't see any difference. Consolidation Coal Company and bosses are still giving away with the same things they always gave away with — and that's killing miners because they want that ton of coal, that production."

Another West Virginia miner said of another young miner's death: The guys on the section had just finished handling集中 about the continuous miner. This shouldn't be done. They should go to a designated dinner place to eat... but if you eat around the continuous miner, you might be able to save a few minutes and produce a few more tons of coal.

When they were through eating, the continuous miner operator turned on the power to the machine, which is not supposed to start any moving parts. Instead, the machine was defective, and the rotating steel bits, like the rotating bits of a chaff corn, suddenly began to turn. The operator's helper, unseen by the operator, was feeding against the bits — and was killed instantaneously.

MINERS ALONE HOLD SOLUTIONS

The one thread that holds true for all of the miners' actions in the present and expected developments is the conclusion that the miners, and they alone, must have the power to enforce safety in the mines. This is a principle that the United Mine Workers of America has upheld and insisted upon, for they know very well that until they have the authority to ensure the safety provisions, there will never be any effective enforcement of safety in the mines.

March 1973
The linking of the name of Lin Piao with that of Confucius as if neither the 2,500-year age separating the two, nor death separating both from the living against whom the current anti-cultural revolution is directed, has not stopped the China specialists in the pragmatic West from once again not only hazy deciphering the big character wall posters, but is also building these analyses on the untenable assumption that the aged Mao remains the ever-young, ever-pure, ever-uncompromising world revolutionary who has set out to create a new China Mao in his own continuing revolutionary image.

RUSSIA, MODEL; RUSSIA, ENEMY NO. 1

The truth, however, is that even before Mao gained state power, when he was a practicing revolutionary, it never was as a world revolutionary but as a Chinese revolutionary nationalist who so distrusted the proletarian that his most original contribution to "Maoist strategy" was to outlaw the cities and have the army take over while the proletariat continued to work at their benches and the peasants in the fields. The great achievements of winning over both imperialism and the reactionary Chiang K'ai-shek, as well as unifying the country, were not so much as accomplished by Mao as set out to rule in Stalin's image. The commanding Communist heights in the state regime rested on a state-capitalist base that was openly so acknowledged as they followed the first Five-Year Plan.

When seven years later the opposition to Mao's regime turned out to come from the left, he showed his little tolerance as Russian rulers do for their. Indeed, nowhere was this clearer than in the break with Russia when the Sino-Soviet conflict came to a climax in the so-called "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution." Even so, the American bombs were raining on North Vietnam, making it the besieged fortress, the Chinese xenophobes disregarded all communist front for the anti-war forces in support of Vietnam. And, finally, and again, Russia and China each sacrificed the socialist economy of one another for the best carrot for Nixon.

Now, whether one starts with the current attack on the TV and radio coverage of the play as not recognizing just how "counter-revolutionary" that opera was, one looks, "realistically," at the new no. 3 man on the Politburo, Wang Hung-wen, as the "rival" who's challenging Chou En-lai's foreign policy, the deeper truth is that the Red Flag document and warnings against "sitting on one's laurels" and "sliding into this or that faction" are actually attempts at once to make sure that the Mao displacements with what is present policy at home and abroad does not self-develop. Mao-Chou are presently bent on seeing that the opposition does not take on the proportions of the "Great Cultural Revolution," Bloomberg. While a section of the youth, like the youth of the 70s, looked Mao at his word that it was "right to rebel," both in the inaction and in the fields questions are raised as to mobilizing.

I'm not saying that there are no divisions within the leadership, much less that the leaders aren't already fighting over who's to wear Mao's mantle when he dies. Nor am I saying that there isn't an attempt to curb the military power which no doubt gained ascendancy at the Ninth Party Congress, over which Lin Piao presided and was named Mao's closest confidant-in-arms. But the truth is very obvious: the greater role of the army wasn't due to any "counter-revolution" by Lin Piao. Mao always set a high priority for the military and specifically called it in to put down the left which they began calling anarchism.

The present shuffling of military commanders from their own positions to new locations is just that, just a shuffling about, intra-party, intra-bureaucracy, within the ruling bureaucracy. Not a single one has been removed; many old CP hands have been returned back to power. And above all, the debate with American imperialism goes on space everywhere and anywhere, including the Middle East and Western Europe where China prefers American imperialism to Russian expansionism. Russia, of course, does the exact same thing in bidding for the U.S. hand against China.

WHY MAO'S GROUND?

What is it we're supposed to read into the Chinese poetic flair within new Unionbauer that Confucius and Lin Piao are "like two brothers on the same root?" We are all supposed to take it when Lin Piao defamed both Mao and the China Emperor who had self-criticized and de-idealized himself. But, was that supposed to represent the "extremist's" view that Mao was gone, whereas those followers Confucius were the "reactionary's" and Mao's? Isn't it more reasonable, instead, of a period B.C. and very much today, 1979, where the educational emphasis has been reduced and after the "Cultural Revolution"?

Now, whether one starts with the current attack on the TV and radio coverage of the play as not recognizing just how "counter-revolutionary" that opera was, one looks, "realistically," at the new no. 3 man on the Politburo, Wang Hung-wen, as the "rival" who's challenging Chou En-lai's foreign policy, the deeper truth is that the Red Flag document and warnings against "sitting on one's laurels" and "sliding into this or that faction" are actually attempts at once to make sure that the Mao displacements with what is present policy at home and abroad does not self-develop. Mao-Chou are presently bent on seeing that the opposition does not take on the proportions of the "Great Cultural Revolution," Bloomberg. While a section of the youth, like the youth of the 70s, looked Mao at his word that it was "right to rebel," both in the inaction and in the fields questions are raised as to mobilizing.

I'm not saying that there are no divisions within the leadership, much less that the leaders aren't already fighting over who's to wear Mao's mantle when he dies. Nor am I saying that there isn't an attempt to curb the military power which no doubt gained ascendancy at the Ninth Party Congress, over which Lin Piao presided and was named Mao's closest confidant-in-arms. But the truth is very obvious: the greater role of the army wasn't due to any "counter-revolution" by Lin Piao. Mao always set a high priority for the military and specifically called it in to put down the left which they began calling anarchism.

The present shuffling of military commanders from their own positions to new locations is just that, just a shuffling about, intra-party, intra-bureaucracy, within the ruling bureaucracy. Not a single one has been removed; many old CP hands have been returned back to power. And above all, the debate with American imperialism goes on space everywhere and anywhere, including the Middle East and Western Europe where China prefers American imperialism to Russian expansionism. Russia, of course, does the exact same thing in bidding for the U.S. hand against China.
TWO WORLDS

BY Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

Editor's Note: A new biography of Jean-Paul Sartre, by Francis Jeanson, has just come off the press. So much of it rests on Sartre's own autobiography, The Words, that we felt this critique of the work written by Raya Dunayevskaya was appropriate to share with NAL readers, although space prohibits printing more than brief excerpts. We suggest that it be accompanied by a reading of Chapter 5 of Philosophy and Revolution, "Jean-Paul Sartre: Outsider Looking In." Now that Sartre calls himself a "Marxist," it will be interesting to watch his articles in the May 5 elections in France.

THE SHOCK OF Jean-Paul Sartre's autobiographical The Words is its seeming ambivalence on the author's stated concepts of commitment.

The author has created a strange admixture of reminiscence and recollection that is more ideological essay than autobiography. Literal sections seem to be written as if they were illustrating various existentialist themes.

The remembrance of things past is written not alone in the present, but in the future tense. A mariner of the pen, Sartre so interpenetrates the next projection into the remembrance of the past that one isn't always sure which is actual experience and which analysis.

The descriptions are too "objective," too distant, as if not the child, but the adult philosopher of existence, was substituting a constructed existence for a lived one. This is the cause of the ambivalence of the book as a whole, and the last section in particular.

When the book first appeared in France the ambivalence made the reviewers sit up with a start. Sartre's statement, "I have changed," seemed to them to refer not to the change from the bourgeois child to "Marxist," but from writer to one who values literature very nearly for its own sake. "For the last ten years or so," wrote Sartre, "I've been more the philosopher, cured of a long, bitter-sweet madness, and who can't get over the fact, a man who can't think of his old way without laughing and who doesn't know what to do with himself. I've again become the traveler without a ticket that I was at the age of seven..." (p. 235). When the reviewers implied that he had changed his position in commitment, Sartre felt impelled to grant an interview to Le Monde in which he not only restated his old position, but questioned the value of any literary creation "in a society that is hungry." Later, in refusing the Nobel prize, he once again restated his choice of allies between "socialism" and "capitalism."

DUE WEIGHT MUST, of course, be given to both statements. Nevertheless, it is inconceivable that so great a master of language could not have expressed with precision and from the start exactly what he felt and thought. The Words will have to stand on its own feet.

D. H. Lawrence expressed most profoundly the problem we face here when he was confronted, in his studies in Classic American Literature, with the contradiction between teller and tale: "An artist is usually a daunted liar, but his art, if it be art, will tell you the truth of his day."

Sartre was born in 1895. The Words tells the story of the first twelve years of his life, but the book does not limit itself to these years. Various earlier years are brought in, generally quite suddenly, but not continually. Each year beyond 1917 is referred to in its special reason for being. One especially is brought in several times. Its purpose is to serve as a turning point in Sartre's life, the transition from a bourgeois, meaningless existence to one where the writer as artist goes beyond a situation, projects himself, is witness to being uprooted. The year is 1917.

The crucial reason, for making a veritable philosophical category of the year was that it is the year Sartre wrote Nausea...
THIS IS THE PERIOD also, although Sartre does not mention this, when he returned from his stay in Berlin. Just as he and Simone de Beauvoir had gone for vacation in Italy— and gone "without scruple"—because Mussolini had cut railway prices 10 per cent to attract tourists to the Fascist Exhibition, so he went to Hitler Germany to study at the Freiburg Institute. It wasn't that he sympathized in any way whatever with fascism. Quite the contrary. He considered himself of the Left and was sud- denly during his stay in Germany when Dollfuss curtailed the Austrian socialist youth. As Mme. de Beauvoir puts it quite frankly in her memoirs: "We would not see our own shoulders in the wheel of history, but we wanted to believe that it was turning in the right direction; otherwise we would have had too many problems to rethink." (The Prince of Life, p. 140)

So instead, Sartre went on with the study of Husserl's philosophy in whose phenomenological style Sartre was then writing, "The Transcendence of the Ego." Evidently they were either unreviewed or unaware of the fact that the philosopher whom they so admired was barred from the library of his university since he was a Jew and thus was not permitted access by his most famous pupil, Martin Heidegger who was then Rector of the University and an active Nazi.

Now, Sartre was surely not an Anti-Semite; he was apolitical, totally so. The shaking off of what his grand- father imposed on him when he was a child—bourgeois idealism, writing at destiny's calling, which Sartre refers to as his "tutelage," books as a substitute for life as well as the culturists of literary creation that he experi- enced when he was on his own, which he felt first when he reached the age of thirty and wrote Nausea: all this and more made him famous as writer.

BUT IT IS NOT this which established him as very nearly the spokesman for a generation. That only came with the Resistance and directly after liberation when he became "enfant terrible." This is the "conversion" that is crucial. It is true that that period is not within the prov- ince of The Words, but not a single marker is set up for it while many are set up for the year 1925. The Words does not give us the slightest sense of inner crisis; it doesn't give us that man, and this isn't because Sartre has changed again. Sartre makes no effort of any kind to give us the quality of that inner crisis because there was "no conversion." Sartre remains—Jean-Paul.

The "PI" that changed, the quality the critics saw as a reversal as the question of political action, is but a con- tinuation of apolitical politics. The Resistance was broad enough in composition and intense enough in its action, in its inercent sense of urgency, that no philosophical circle of the various political tendencies emerged. The minute the war was over, however, and the varied tenden- cies clashed, that minute Sartre's inherent evasiveness reappeared.

This evasion was not merely one about taking sides between "theirs", the varied tendencies within Marxism. The evasion, the flight from contradiction was a flight into his own existentialist philosophy and its concept of individual freedom as against Marx's concept of human- ity's freedom. Not, please, I said Marx's not Marxist; I didn't mean Sartre is seen double-tongued on the ques- tion. Quick look at a major philosophical essay in the period after Liberation will show what I mean.

DEVO TED TO EXORCISING the materialist "myth" from the philosophy of revolution, Materialism and Revolu- tion appears to argue against Communists and Trotsky- nists, but is, in fact, a direct attack on Karl Marx. Thus Sartre writes: "Let us make no mistake; there is no simple transcendence of materialism and idealism here..." (p. 601) In a footnote he refers to the fact that Marx thought otherwise; but, instead of quoting him, Sart- re quotes Communist interpretations of Marx. And he quoted Marx. Sartre could not, of course, have made the point that, without existentialism, the human element gets swallowed up in "dialectical materialism."

Marx went in great length in his Communist-Philoso- phic Manuscripts, 1844, to show why he does not con- sider Communism the goal of human development, the form of human society; why he insists, instead, on dis- tinguishing his philosophy as a "thoroughgoing Naturalsim or Humanism" which distinguishes itself from both Ideal- ism and Materialism: "It is, at the same time, the truth unifying them both." Sartre's criticism of Communists, on the other hand, went hand in hand with his refutation that the Communist Party was "the only revolutionary party." (p. 602) Again: "We shall call revolutionary the party or the person in the party whose acts intentionally prepare such a revolution... in the same way, we cannot call the American Negroes revolutionaries, though their interests may coincide with those of the party which is working for the revolution." (p. 603)

What should be obvious is that the contradiction in Sartre is not between philosophy and action. The guilt is between two opposing philosophies: Sartrean existential- ism and its corollary, the myth invented by it of the Communist Party being "the only revolutionary party," and Marx's humanism which seeks no need for bourgeois or Communist idealism manifested in a party of all sorts, "a party to lead..."
TWO WORLDS

By Pana Dauyenyberge
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

I am very happy to give my space this issue for reprinting excerpts from the section on Negritude contained in a speech delivered by the great Haitian poet, Rene Depestre, at the Tri-National Congress in Havana in 1968. Complete copies can be obtained from INVISIBLE CITY, 8 Sun Gabriel Drive, Fillmore, California 91325.

Haiti today is the country where one can most easily recognize the advantages of negritude, because one is the land where, as Alme C tuner has said, "it took its stand for the first time," and where it is so well identified with the identity which founds the most monstrous tyranny in contemporary history. That's why a critical examination of the concept of negritude, in the light of the terrible Haitian experience, can have an efficacious significance for all oppressed blacks. We know that all ideology, as far as it represents something real and pursues certain objectives, has a tendency to give to the particular aspirations of one class an imaginary value. Marx called mystification such a process of deformation of reality.

In Haiti, pseudo-ideologists such as Francois Duvalier, studying the role of negritude in our national history, always consider the concept as a thing in itself, rather than analyzing it in its relations with the true history of racial conditions. By separating the racial question from the economic and social development of Haiti, and assigning it an absolute character, by making it mystical, they have debased Haitian history by a chaotic succession of merely ethnic conflicts between mulattos and blacks. . . . In the Haitian case, the racial question, far from being the determining factor in the development of Haitian society, is merely the mystifying form which, in the consciousness of two aristocratic rivals, serves to hide Hitler's commitment to yesterday's concentration camps among those the yankess of the Pentagon perpetrate today in the two Vietnams.

NATURALLY the tyranny of Duvalier offers a curious caricature of negritude, and it's not necessary to conclude . . . that such a twisted nationalism is directly due to an enterprise involving the annihilation of the human condition. Socialism is a doctrine of the liberation of man, but national-socialism was an instrument for his extermination . . . Today the black bourgeoisie, who possess non-colonialist privileges of intrigue and violence in Africa and America, have primarily utilized the concept of negritude as an ideological weapon because they

NEGRI T UDE AS REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION

real interests and momentums from the class struggle.

NOMINETHESS this racial question is a very important racial reality in the history of Haiti. We know that Marx, by way of denying that spiritual dogmas had a decisive role in the historic process of determined societies, nevertheless believed that as racial realities they could affect the general course of history . . . Since 1960, the Haitian society has been the prey of general crisis, fundamentally due to the economic domination of the United States over the country, with the color question once again occupying the foremost ideological and political place, but only in order to cover up the real content of the class struggle. Black middle-men like Duvalier, who since 1960 has been allied to the black bourgeoisie and the multiracial "comrades," control political power, demagogically keeping themselves in permanent possession of "negritude" and pretending to the black masses that it's they who are in power and that the "Duvalierist revolution" is a sparkling victory for negritude.

The awful Duvalier dictatorship has made the Haitians change the image that they've had of themselves . . . In their eyes, Haiti has stepped being integrated into the mythic figure that has been patiently printed in the consciousness of every Haitian since school-days: Haiti, first black republic of modern times, mythic fatherland of the black man, cradle and cradle of neocolonialism. Haitians have discovered through untold sufferings that, in a semi-colonial system, the power that should be spread among black, white, mulatto or Indian hands, remains inviolable an instrument for ferocious dehumanization, in terms of man and his social and cultural setting . . . Haitians behold blacks and mulattos, tyrants, criminals without shame, scoundrels, Nazis, tenacious, because in fact they are without any individualizing essence, they're as mediocre as the rest.
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justly know that... this concept has powerfully express-
ed the double character of alienation among oppressed bred. In this context, for a given moment in the story of de-colonization, became the effective reality of the black man, exploited and humiliated and facing the global contempt of the white colonizer...

Thus negativity, in the best sense of the word, was the cultural operation by which the black intellectuals of Africa and the two Americas recognized the validity and originality of Negro-African cultures, the aesthetic value of the black race, and the capacity for respectful people to exercise the right to historical initiative that colonization had completely suppressed. Negritude, in its most authentic sense, was at the outset (in the poetry of Cesaire, for example) the influence upon consciousness of the fact that the proletarian black is doubly alienated: alienated on the one hand (like the proletarian white) by being endowed with a work-power that is sold on the capitalist market and alienated on the other hand by having a black pigmentation, alienated, that is, in his epidermal singularity. Negritude was the consciousness of this double alienation and of the historical necessity to go beyond it, in means of a revolutionary praxis.

WE MUST not forget, with respect to racist ideology, that the crime of the black man (besides his proletarian status) is that of his light-skinned. This adores mystification at an ideologic level continues to be a weapon one runs into in the United States, in South Africa, in Rhodesia, used against Blacks. The epidermal singularity of the black or colored man, instead of being taken for what it is, that is, one of the objective accidents that the history of humanity theses with, becomes a matter of essence, the sign of an absolute evil of the black social being in the consciousness of all the states of the world — the necessity and actuality with. We need, as a consequence, to give a metaphysical and aesthetic significance to the color black as we have to the color white...

Negritude, in literature, in art, as in ethnology and history was from its inception a form of authentic revolt opposed to the contemptible manifestations of racist depth in the world. It was colonization which through gun, gancart, and blood, had opened the bleeding white-black contradiction in the very wombs of universal history, in order to conceal and thereby justify the plundering of capitalist exploitation. Negritude posed the necessity for going beyond that contradiction, not through a new mystic operation, but by way of a revolutionary praxis that was collective. Unfortunately, more often than not, the concept of negritude has been utilized as a myth which serves to conceal the presence of black bourgeoisie on the scene... and at any class which oppresses another class. It has need of an ideologic mystification to cover up the real nature of its established connections within the society.

TODAY, with mystifiers both black and white, negritude implies the absurd idea that the black is endowed with a particular "human nature", endowed with an essence that might only belong to him, and to that extent, he is called upon, according to a positivist like J. Piaget, to lead to Europe and the West. I don't know what sort of "supplemental soul-life", which colonial civilization is in need of. For the president of Senegal, the poet Leopold Sedar Senghor, "emulsion in black and reason Greek..."

In such a way all class contradictions are drowned in abstraction, and the black bourgeoisie of Africa and America can sincerely and with the blessing of neo-colonialism freely exploit the black workers in the name of a spiritual commune... According to this elementary and insolent logic, negritude as thus understood, far from articulating a revolutionary enterprise of total dis-

alienation and de-colonization of Africa and the two black Americas, merely arrives at covering up the fact that it is one of the columns holding up the edifices,aurus and perilous actions of neo-colonialism. Separated from the historical context of revolution across the board of the Third World, arbitrarily presented from the im-
mEDIATE edges of the global, transcultural struggle of under-developed peoples against imperialism and neo-colonialism, negritude defines an unacceptable "black ilegalism" with the help of which we would here like to dismiss black peoples from the duty of making revolu-
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Playing politics with nuclear fuel

NIXON-KISSINGER JOURNEY TO SAVE 'THE PRESIDENCY'

By Ray Dunnevage, National Chairwoman
News & Letters Committees

Nixon's Middle East trip that was billed as a "journey for peace," and was palpably political, was insinuated early in the game into the volatile tinderbox. This Nixon-type of "even-handedness" at the very moment when India proved how "peaceful" nuclear reactors can be used to make atomic bombs is nothing short of sheer madness, that of retrogressive capitalism out for single world domination.

That Russia, for the moment, continues with yet another summit with Nixon cannot divert from the fact that that nuclear giant is out for the same type of "bargaining." It only proves that both nuclear Titans are in such abyssal crises at home that they have no place to turn but toward.

For that matter, Nixon's start of his Middle East journey began in Austria—not exactly the most direct path between the United States and the Arab lands. The claim that the Austrian stopover was to accustom Nixon to the charm of time zones was belied by the fact that Kissinger was off to Germany to meet with its foreign minister, the minute they landed.

FIRST FOCUS: EUROPE

Furthermore, this was preceded by the feelers put out to France and Germany just as soon as Helmut Schmidt came to the helm in Germany and Giscard in France. So June 9, Flora Lewis, who heads the Paris bureau of the New York Times, reported that "neither government planned to take the initiative and issue an invitation" to President Nixon.

The present cooled relations are due not alone to Kissinger being acutely declared 1973 "the year of Europe." While that was his biggest flag, Nixon's previous for foreign policy was to divert from his crises at home. To divert from his crises at home. Europe's anger is due to its own disarray. Ever since the Arab-Israeli war and consequent oil crisis underlined the whole world economy, Europe has played a sorry role. The capitulation to the Arab demand for both quadruple oil prices and sliding not only against itself but against the "Pander" (U.S.A.), dramatized the very concept of the "European Union." The proof of its non-acting was that every country worked only for itself, and for any non-existing "European Union." By then, the only line that declared Europe to be "the main focus" was China. So while all the cameras were to be clicking on the Nix, Kissinger wanted West Europe to consider whether it wouldn't really want to know.

The composition for the "European connection" comes from the global needs of both the U.S. and Russia, China's new role, and the stand over the whole of West that as ready to meet in October, 1973.

The expression, "the main focus," to explain the key role of Europe in global politics, specifically that between Russia and China, is that of Teng Hsiao-ping. He used it in a July speech that the elections in England but nevertheless was treated in Peking as a high priority. He clearly the "hush of England but "spoke for Europe" — a Europe which understood the threat of Russian.

CHINA'S NEW VIEW OF EUROPE

The world did not stand still while Kissinger took out a whole month to shuttle between Europe and Asia. Germany and France had moved further to the right. China was busy not only with its own Cultural Revolution at home but with acting out abroad what she meant by a "new division" of the world.

Suddenly, West European capitalism was chiselled as "second world," proper ally for "Third World," which, so far as China is concerned, means principally China, without which the Third World isn't. China has also been busy taking full advantage of the non-scandal that toppled Willy Brandt. Since it proves that Russia keeps having: "sleepers" like Guillaume in Brandt's entourage for top level missions, China is acting as if she (along with other capitalists, private and state), doesn't do the same. China is trying out how to use that fact to establish a special role for herself.

In the face of all this, Nixon is working hard to see that nothing shall stand in the way of his next spectacular to Russia. Before departing again, Kissinger, at his last Washington press conference, hinted that the Middle East trip is not the first step in Nixon's "journey to peace." It would "possibly" be followed by a new nuclear strategic arms limitation that Nixon would get in Moscow.

Along with that carrot as "real" reason for the further spectacles that will bring "generations of peace," came the situation surprise: Kissinger's special press conference, in which he threatened to resign if the campaign to besmirch his "honor" regarding westing-station isn't stopped at once. The letter was addressed to Senate leaderstick as head of the Foreign Relations Committee. Kissinger hardly finished reading the statement in Staline than the Committee and unanimously concluded him to be an honorable man who must not "even consider resigning" (Stalin's phrase). Other voices were not that quickly silenced. In any case, whether this public surprise was Nixon's way of getting Kissinger up for the kill, or Kissinger trying to separate himself from Watergate so that, no matter what the outcome used some, he will be asked to remain at his post, the point is the American people are being played with.

SECOND FOCUS: THE MIDDLE EAST

The staged outpouring of the Egyptian people to whom Nixon told a great deal about how badly Israel wished not only to cut relations with Russia and be once again with the West, especially the U.S. It was also for the purpose of turning away from Nasr's "socialism" and counter-attacks. That it tells very little of how the masses feel could be seen from the simple fact that even on so controlled a state occasion, signs also told Nixon that Egypt is with the Palestinian refugees.

It is true that Watergate doesn't mean much to Egypt. The Suez Canal means everything, the gateway to Europe as well as Africa and even globally. What is important is not only the closing of the Canal, but its deepening to allow super tankers through—a way to industrialize the Suez, linked so wonderfully with getting Saudi Arabia to use oil as a political weapon. Not that Saudi Arabia did it for Egypt rather than itself.
This is obvious enough from both the crises in the whole world economy that withholding of oil brought about, and the anxiety of the U.S. to take responsibility for economic and military, especially military, development.

Moreover, it is not only against Russia that Saudi Arabia adheres to the U.S. The U.S. is preferred also as against West Germany, whose technology is as highly developed, who conducted itself during the Arab-Israeli war, and who is most anxious to provide to "new philosophy" about the struggle for the "world product," as if that, rather than world production, defines one's place in the world. In any case, King Faisal hasn't given up "winning over" Nixon, and U.S. oil monopolies.

Saudi Arabia, rather than even Israel, is the outpost of this imperialist system in the Middle East. This does not mean that Israel isn't an outpost of U.S. imperialism, but it wasn't so at its birth which unrolled as a struggle against British imperialism. Moreover, many who participated in the struggle were not Zionist, but revolutionary Jewish socialists who were not accepted by any so-called democracy, especially the United States, and were thus forced to make the Exodus to Palestine. All Arab rulers, without any exception whatever, then, were feudal oligarchs—to much so, in fact, that Stalin's Russia, not the U.S., was the first to cast its eye for the creation of that new state of Israel. The renunciation of Israel into a state-capitalist society since then is another story. Presently, Arab rulers' ambitions, as Israel's, need to subordinate themselves to the global rivalry between Russia and the U.S. for global world domination.

It is this nuclear rivalry that was Kissinger's trump card during the Arab-Israeli war when he was trying to convince the Arab ruling classes that not Israel but Russia was the "main enemy." For that enemy was a nuclear power that could not be that easily "neutralized." It is this very problem that was seen as the prime justification of the oil kingdom's dedication for the quadrupling of oil prices as well as "even-handedness" on the part of the U.S. But now its hatred for Israel is taking second place to "defending" the U.S. The Nasser Administration, in return, is an anxious to be "even-handed" as long as Russia is still ready to tie her hands before marching itself a direct confrontation with an U.S. behemoth.

Of course, the trip has been undertaken to save "face" and, of course, to at least array some political as this trip is, this is not the whole.

The whole is the mighty imperalite nuclear power that the U.S. wants uncontested by any other power. And that is true not just for Nixon: it is true for any conceivable party in the West European or Eastern blocs.

PERPETUAL MOBILE OF U.S. IMPERIALISM

Let's take a look at the Central Treaty Organisation that quality met in Washington, D.C. That brain-child of John Foster Dulles used to be called the Baghdad Pact. Dulles' parenthesis was supposedly suffered its death blow when Iraq had its national revolution in 1958. The truth is that, when terrorism in Iran, that Washington-funded imperialist power output simply re-named itself Central Treaty Organisation. Regular as clockwork in this latest, the foreign ministers of Great Britain, Italy, Pakistan (the U.S. is supposed just an observer) all assembled in Washington. The "independent" Kissinger was away in the Middle East, those Cold-War-anti-Soviet satellites made it obvious they were ready to beat up the Cold War—and not just against Russia but their own masses—but once again inserting in the final communiqué the Iran talk of the need to combat the "continuing subversive threat against the regime." By "region" they meant, of course, the exploitative class power. The added joke is that Pakistan, which has certainly moved very far away from its original reason for being a member of the "Northern Tier" anti-Communist alliance, was present (with Mina's unspoken consent). So was Great Britain's Labor Front Foreign Secretary, James Callaghan.

This perpetual mobile of U.S. world imperialism, even when only the stand-off satellites are playing out the roles, is what Nixon-Kissinger's journey to save the "President" a more ambivalent role than just an escape from Watergate and impeachment.

For that matter, once Great Britain is playing the same imperialistic game with the Common Market, supposedly, with the "victory" of Wilson over Heath, it is "re-constituting" with that Common Union pretending to be a way to a "European Union," as it that were one nation, sealed at that. Great Britain will remain part of the Common Market and for the same restrictive trade reasons other members practice against any and all not in it. And it, too, wants not a political union, but a mere customs complementariness.

DEBT WITH RUSSIA

Let's take a second look at debt with Russia. It is because Russia's playing at debts with the U.S. in getting an ever-warmer reception from Nixon the deeper in trouble he is at home, which has sent many shivers down the West European backs. It seems to be witnessing a rebirth of Yalta where the destiny of Europe, East and West, was decided without its presence by the two powers who remained standing on their feet at the end of the holocaust. The only one ready to slag their prestige is China, and that is only to use them as a possible ladder for Russia which holds it to be Enemy No. 1 and which it does not wish unleashed for an attack on China.

Messrs. Schmid and Giscard tartarise on Russians on that score. And they know also that is exactly what Nixon wishes to do and not only with the U.S., but in their lands. Russia is anxious for East-West European summity. The 35 states that were supposed to draft a declaration ratifying the territorial changes resulting from World War II (victoria it is, say "the West," obviating "the U.S."). And Russia is ready to play that game with Russia, but France and Germany are not. Total deadlock has resulted; they see no July summit in Helsinki.

Whether or not Nixon will succeed, in getting himself invited to Helsinki, in getting the two superpowers to come to or from the U.S., or whether he will have his Russian delegate and on the way it will come out of the NATO Ottawa meeting, June 18-19, but he will be in West Europe, with or without direct invitation from Europe, as Europe. He has already announced that he will address NATO in Brussels on the Swiss Russian. That is all part of the game of "debt" played the imperialist way.

Thus, with or without any East-West Europe summit; with or without being to the Kissinger demands for "conciliation" before the next the West Europeans nations vote as a unit, Nixon-Kissinger are setting themselves a course of the meeting ahead: the Palestine question in the Middle East, the internal internal monetary crisis, the quadrupling of oil prices, that is undermining the world economy, Europe...
Japan which is suddenly likewise being included in "the West" (1), the Western pieces of Europe, and the Nine-Soviet conflict that is the real reason of the new flirtation with the U.S.

All that can be done. What cannot be done is a covariance of the crises at home, economic and political, radical and class, Watergate and other high crimes. And it’s back home Nixon must return.

HOME IS WHERE THE "ENEMY" IS

The crime-tainted Nixon Administration didn’t begin at Watergate. It began the day Nixon took office on a "law and order" platform which not only his lawless Attorney General Mitchell carried out against the mass anti-Vietnam War movement, youth especially, Blacks in particular, anti-labor in general. No, it began equally with "Mr. Clean" Henry Kissinger, who, as head of National Security, ordered J. Edgar Hoover (who didn’t require much urging) to illegally tap the phones of his own colleagues and those journalists, especially the New York Times, which had revealed a secret order about the bombing of Cambodia with which we were not at war.

So secret were those 1969 bumbling mistakes that not many even among the Pentagon brass knew about their full extent—until 1973. Yet Mr. Clean, in Sahlburg, dared demand the "revelations" of newspaper sources. Shades of that cheap crook that occupied the post of Vice-President and first unleashed the campaign against freedom of the press.

So it is neither dirty-word Nixon nor anti-freedom-of-the-press Agnew, neither clean Kissinger nor the tortoise-moving impeachment committees who can be depended upon for anything except against Nixon. For that matter, look at the New York Times and its "myth of integrists" that nation Nixon, James Reston is busy defending us against "Cassandras," who speak as if only inflation, Watergate, Vietnam and generally a greed and corruption inflation were characteristic of USA, 1974. In fact, says our pundit, the fact that everything is "under discussion" proves "we are coming into an age of philosophy ..."

(New York Times, 6/8/74)

So we are, but this "age of philosophy" is inseparable from the age of revolution. Which is why it cannot possibly come from those busy telling us the U.S. is not really corrupt, racist, imperialistic. The passion for philosophy comes from the masses thoroughly fed up with the system, including its intelligence that has an excuse for everything from the continuing anti-black hysteria to the growing unemployment and galloping inflation.

Here is how one top economist, Saul B. Klaman of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, elaborates away those wrong predictions about "no recession" coming from congress and their "human" predictions: "How does a forecast factor into his equations the "Watergate syndrome?" An impeachment inquiry? International political upheaval? Changing investor expectations? Erase consumer sentiment? The imposition and lifting of embargoes?"

You can’t, but that is not the question. The question is: Why should people treat seriously the 1972 prediction of a 3.25 percent rate of inflation when, in fact, it was not only 6.4 percent but that was as for the intentional giants only, while for the consumer the galloping pace is hardly calculable? And why treat "the system" with any more credulity than even the secretariat Treasury bond of $30 million is set at an 8.6 percent rate, which is the highest since the Civil War era? And why act as if "philosophy" without revolution can give the answer to so simple a question as equal education when for a full century the Supreme Court looked the other way at "separate but equal" misclassification. And when, finally, it was encapsulated (both by the continuing revolt at home and the new world crisis of the 1960s) to reverse itself, we have suffered through no less than 20 years of counter-upheaval?”

No wonder the Blacks have no use whatever, not just for the Nixon Administration, but for the system. No wonder that no less than 200 Blacks (with some whites) jumped on a ship in Japan, refusing to return to the "land of the free and the brave." No wonder that, very nearly, all new white foods in the mines, in order, and not only in factories and mines but in the fields, in the post office which demands that, "to prove you are the man," a woman seven months pregnant, must lift 70 pounds—or be fired.

No, "the age of philosophy" cannot be separated from the age of revolution that is surging from below.

—June 17, 1974
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Why Hegel? Why Now? —— a critique

By Rava Dornayevsky

So many anti-Hegelians, who consider themselves Marxists, have surfaced to attack Philosophy and Revolution, that I felt it only proper to give the floor to a German revolutionary Marxist of the Old Left whose individual view objectively sums up the others.

Dear Rava:

I do not believe in "Hegel Now." I think it can only lead to more confusion. Sure, I am for studying Hegel now as I was in the 70's when "Lenin's Notes" appeared. But not much more than for studying Spinoza, Herder, etc. I am afraid it is, again, a smuggling away from Marx. It is the same, exactly the same, as when the great intellectuals started to go back to the "Young Marx." I enjoy, and will agree with, every word of the "Young Marx," but I do not need the "Young Marx" (he really meant what he said about the "passing mice") since I have a much better (concrete) one from the year 1852 on.

Engels hit it right when, at Marx's funeral, after summarizing the great theoretical, philosophical and scientific achievements, he said: "For Marx was before all else a revolutionary. And if you don't take the one who, rightfully, speaks as much about theory and practice—where was Hegel's practice? Hegel ran away. He was first a journalist (practically) and then took refuge in the university, while Marx ("turning Hegel on his head") started to become a professor, but decided to accept the editorship of the "Rheinische Zeitung.""

I do not believe, even without having to see your book, that you know your Hegel better than Lassalle did. Lassalle went to Birkmarck. Lassalle was not a renegade: it was the Hegel of Hegel to go to Birkmarck. Walking through the streets of East Germany, I saw plenty of Lassalian socialism, and nowhere is Hegel taught as much as at the university in Leipzig. Everywhere on the walls you see the good Hegelian word "people." Volks, but not once "proletariat!"

I AGREE, HEGEL introduced the idea of freedom into philosophy by saying: "The people will learn to feel the dignity of man." Here truly in the genius of Hegel. But "Hegel Now?!" When he lived he was 40 years after Marx and Bakunin—and still did go as far as they? His horror against them is somewhat the same as yours against Mao. What other effect can your Hegelianism have than winning friends for something which is away, and backwards, from the real Marx? (What the real Marx is, you know from his letter to Weydemeyer from 1853, the decisive year, by the way.)

Lenin was right that one should study Hegel to be better able to understand Marx, but one does not need Hegel to understand Marx. Lenin spoke to revolutionaries who fell for Kautsky, etc.—like he, himself, did, before he had studied Hegel. You, however, speak through the Daily company, to people who at best are on their way to becoming revisionist. One can be a revolutionary without Hegel.

WHY HEGEL NOW? Why not Feuerbach Now??

After all, Feuerbach was just as important as Hegel. Feuerbach, and not Hegel, was the first in the whole history of Philosophy who introduced consciously the idea of "WE" instead of the "I." (For Hegel even "the people" were still "I").

If you give today's intellectuals only Hegel (or at best Marx via Hegel), they will never understand the proletariat and Marx's and Engels' discovery from the "Holy Family" on: More important than Marxism as a whole is the development of the thought of Marx and Engels, and if you wish, the development from Hegel, but from many, many others than Hegel. They learned much, much more from Feuerbach than from the whole of Hegel. Why go back to Hegel who still, contrary to the French and English, does not have a complete, clear, relation with Theology, no matter what his God really consisted of? Today's intellectuals will never, and that was Lukacs' mistake, understand the proletariat from studying Hegel. The task is not only to understand the dialectic of class struggle and thereby discover our Freedom and Humanism, but the role of the proletariat. That, and that alone, the young people have to be taught, and that one can get only from Marx and Engels and Lenin and Luxemburg and from Trotsky and Mao (for one can say such things since I never, never agreed with anything typically Trotsky'') — and never from Hegel. Any one of the proletarian revolutionaries is worth more than the whole of Hegel.

ISN'T IT TYPICAL that the official Intellectuals in the West as well as in the East fall for "Alienation"? Sure, a good word, very Hegelian and Marxist, but there is a very, very good reason why Marx since 1862 did not use this word any more except in connection with labor in the production process. Every liberal you can impress with the slogan "Alienation", but he will still be a liberal. Indeed, the best way to become and feel a liberal is the outcry against "Alienation", because the best way to reduce (not abolish) "Alienation" is to make the fellow "interesting" —if the horse could only be in-
U.S. instigations increase danger of global minefield

By Vyacheslav Bumaginovsky,
Chairman News & Mail Letters Committee,
President Ford's appointment of Nixon's four-star hatchet man, General Haig, as nothing less than general in command of NATO, is on a par with his continuation of Nixon's economic recession, and Kissinger global brinkmanship.

The fact that West Europe's revolution at being caddied with such a "general" did not stop Ford from making the appointment, means that our Mr. Clean will not stop playing dangerous games in the global minefield any more than those critical days in August when Nixon's next move was not known, stopped Defense Secretary Schlesinger from trying with a little "seven days in May" scenario called "overriding the chain of command."

Paradoxical as it may sound, the corrupt Nixon was made culprit of the Watergate caper, that is to say, the patriot-sounding was laid on the sacrificial altar of the decadent capitalist system which had brought him to power in its own image.

RECESSION, INFLATION AND OIL

Recall Arthur Burns who chaired the Federal Reserve Board withodie-money nuts had to say that "6% unemployment dents touch 7% or 8% of income works will have to be inflated. That "7%" is the joke. He knows very well that "adding 6% per cent" is the "average," an "average" that never has applied to black unemployment which is twice the amount of white.

Take two other horror phenomena—aiming at zero growth, in order to slow down inflation. That last horror everyone, even the rich, even President Ford, does recognize as "Public Enemy No. 1." However, here too, the intellectuals manage to evade a greater menace on that subject than even the military-industrial complex, its creators, thus the latest, elitist, invented and totally abstract word is "deflationism." It can briefly be called a precise description of the runaway inflation we're experiencing at the very same time when, far from a bonning economy, we trend to zero growth.

All "stabilization" (inflation and deflation) is a precise description of, is their empty, restless "intellects."

But even if we deal for the moment only quantitatively and below their statistics, we cannot possibly forget the poor record of the "stabilization economists" whose prediction of added stocks was a whopping $7 billion off.

The 1973s have added something new, far, far away from production. Since, if anyone has a very great deal of cash floating around, it's the oil sheikdoms, they have succeeded in inflating the heads of our "dearth-stocked" economists with even more figures than they can dream up, with or without computers.

The International Institute for Strategic Studies in London has estimated that within six short years, the Arab kingdoms, sheikdoms, emirates, plus the Shah of Iran, will control no less than 70% of the world's total monetary reserve. Think of it. By 1983, the oil-producing countries will have liquid assets of a more fantastic sum than $200 billion.

NUCLEAR-ARMED STRUGGLES

The Shah, the kings and the sheikhs then proceed to "insulate" themselves about such gigantic inflationism and inflation of their backward lands, that they don't even know the Red Sea is theirs! This doesn't stop either our "intellectual leaders" or the "intellectual" Shah of Iran from imagining global roles. After all, says the Shah, his country has "an intellectual infrastructure" and it needs of all financial support.

The truth is simpler: the Middle East countries of kingdom, sheikdoms and emirates thus far have very little more than sand and oil, oil, oil, while the techn-
logically advanced lands have the real mines, the steel mills, the auto factories, the petroleum industries, not to forget the military might and enough nuclear bombs to kill the world’s population over and over again. Nixon hadn’t stopped short of introducing the possibility of nuclear war into that volatile equation.

Overhanging all, then, is the question: how do we take power out of the hands of the people in each country, and in this climate, if you will, of a stake in the bomb. For a single household in that, the poor countries, “middle” or otherwise, are coming to the brink in any event. They can always at the expense of their teeming, hungry, famished millions. Nixon, who savagely attacked the poor black—“nuclear fuel”—after India showed it could come up with a “little” H-bomb. Are we supposed to believe that the H-bomb will provide food for the 150 million Indians who vegetate below the poverty line of $10 a year?

PRODUCTION ALONE COUNTS

What these rulers want is control—control, that is, of the entire national economy, of the state system is the relationship of constant capital to labor to variable capitalist/exploiting labor. Labor alone produces all value and surplus value (unpaid hours of labor).

The German ruler, Schmidt, who knows better, tried, indeed, to say that the world struggle for the product—and that product of course was oil rather than production—oil or any other commodity, is the fundamental issue. Therefore, in saying that the power struggle for the product, what he threatened those who would listen to his solution was that, otherwise, they would have to contend with the emerging social storm.

When oil is said and done, that is correct, and it is a nutshell. The leaders from where all production of value is extracted, with as many hours of unpaid as possible, just going to oil quality and let themselves be exploited. Whether the profits are liquid or otherwise, will make a difference, the labor they hunger for and will revolt against and produce a mighty social storm, a revolution.

What is the truth of inflation? Of course, the quadrupling of oil prices has exaggerated the unflagging illusion to so large an extent that it’s easy to see only that it’s a root cause. But long before that scandalous complacency of the world’s oil monopolists, there was the undeclared Vietnam War in which U.S. imperialism sunk national wealth of less than $50-50 billion annually.

Production of armaments isn’t production, much less exploitation. All it produces is death and destruction and—indeed, if the World War II holocaust had hidden the Dynamic of the post-war, inevitable consequence of capitalism—it was only for the time of the heated production—now death, destruction, death! And how soon after that holocaust did the Korean War break out? All capitalism ever does to move from Depressions to War is back again. Such is the nature of the capitalist relationship.

One hundred years ago Marx put succinctly enough, “The only thing the workers own is the national debt.” That keeps us going—‘we have already mortgaged not only our lives but those of our children and grandchildren.”

SOCIAL STORMS

The fears that have been developing capitalism, ever since the second-revolution of 1968 nearly toppled it, were reawakened when the Arabs in 1973 began to use that all-crucial lubricant, oil, as a political weapon, not because of fear of annihilation, but because of the social storms that an economic crisis would evoke.

The same intensity of fear reappeared in spring of 1974 when General Spirova came to power; again, not because of fear of Spirova, but because “advanced” communism knew that (1) the policies of the so-called ‘Socialist’ countries were, indeed, undermining Peron’s coup d’etat, and socialism in general, that in bringing it fascism. That will be an unanswerable threat. The only thing that will bring forth the second social revolution. And (2) they know that Spirova’s “democratization” is by no means the end, but only the beginning of revolutionary developments. This is a threat to the objective situation without being conscious of the revolutionary opposition forces to capitalism and its ideologists, for the masses themselves seek to go beyond spontaneity. They are on the threshold of the only way to theory and practice.

This is what caused the reversal of the said Economist of London to McCarthy-like hysterics. The Red Wolf Wailing to Pouring Southern Europe,” is a desperate cry for the “West” to do some “long range thinking,” for thus far, it writes, “if there is any organized, long-range thinking about ideological expansion being done in Europe today, it’s still in Moscow that it’s happening.”

But, in fact, it isn’t. Russia has half as much as their own rebellious masses that is the “danger.” Helmut Schmidt had preceded the Economist in calling it by its right name, “social storms.” The rulers are all deeply afraid of the passion for philosophy that is inseparable from revolution.

They hope to keep those two separated, first by attributing “ideology” to Russia, and second by calling it “ideological revolution” “apostasy.” But the philosophical-political morality of the age and the masses passion for ideology and transcendence by no means be passed off as any sort of conspiracy made “in Moscow.”

SUPER-POWERS OUT FOR WORLD MASTERY

Should this related McCarthyism (just as fascism, it is sure to reappear in new forms so long as capitalism exists), make you embrace either Russia or China because they had, had revolutions before underlying it, the formation into opposite, state capitalism, remember they have, as in the forms of the state, the struggle for power. Indeed, it is this struggle of the super-powers for single world mastery that defines precisely the mass of the system is to, and will bring it down. It is just this, triangular world out for single world mastery—U.S., Russia, China—which suits the Chinese expression: “Great disorder under heaven.”

A great example of this “great disorder under heaven” is what Zeng came to tell the UN about “great revolutions.” The first was that “the world capitalist world!” the post-WW II has ended that. The
second was even more shocking. Suddenly, even Europe and all those technologically advanced countries that were always considered capitalist were now merely called "second World," "middle countries" with whom the Third World could collaborate.

Finally, the enemy, the superpowers, those designated as not for "hegemony," single world power, were the mother (sister—Russia and the U.S). Here comes the greatest shocker—it turns out that, though both are superpowers, one (Russia) is "especially vicious," Enemy No. 1. There is no limit to the new era of this super-revolutionary who has rallied the red carpet for Nixon, told West Europe to remain in NATO as the needed counterweight to Russia, declared the possibility of a new-Pax-Russica—anything anywhere and all against Russia.

Moreover, Deng did not just limit his "proof" of Russia as Enemy No. 1 to such obviously counter-revolutionary deeds as the invasion of Czechoslovakia but extended it—and in the very same sentence—on the creation of the national revolution of the East Bengalis, which he merely refers to as "the dismemberment of Pakistan," which "dismemberment was "instigated by Russia." And all this was said in the Assembly in which he alone voted the application of Bangladesh for membership.

Western capitalism's fetish of liquidity has its counterpart in China's fetishization of "ideology," which Marx had analyzed as "false consciousness," that of bourgeois intellectuals, and to which he countersigned "a new Humanism," the dialectics of liberation.

MAO'S REDUCTIONISM

The latest such "momentous development" (actually, it was stated in 1963 on rural work, but not so declarative until a decade later) is shown up as something momentous, a new development of Marxism-Leninism-Maoist Thinking. It is this: "A great battle has been transformed into cultural revolution and consciousness change." 

This bourgeois, philosophical ideology, surpassing the limits of thinking itself, was said, and criticized by their leading philosopher, Yang Hua, chairman, and former. Suddenly, one must put the rural workers to work harder and harder, a decade later: "An irrepressible historical trend today for the people of the whole world, and many medium-sized and small countries to unite and oppose hegemony of two superpowers,"

never forgetting, however, that one of these two is "especially vicious" and "has become an international fiend—chant of death." (Excerpts printed in the New York Times, 4/15/74.)

Mao's reductionism of the creative subject as maker of history to sheer voluntarism imposed on peoples by the Chairman is actually a result of what Ni never admitted, but, in fact, everything he says is based on that underlying assumption—his acceptance of state capitalism as the next stage of humanity's "development."

REVOLUTIONARY FORCES

The opposing revolutionary forces that signify the social storms are on the horizon, strive to bear not only as spontaneously but as Reason. They will not experience release, liberation, until this generation stops trying to put its head in the sand about so great, so historic a happening on the movement from practice and recognizes it as having initiated a new epoch for mankind.

Whether we look at the U.S. or Europe, Asia or Latin America, the white Caribbean, the Middle East or Africa, as well as the Black Revolution in America, in the West Indies, throughout the globe indeed, for they are an international people, the pivotal question is this: how many Marxist intellectuals have so much as looked at this movement from practice?

Outside of ourselves — Marxist-Humanist — none.

Yet that which began in 1963 and has persisted for two full decades was a totally new phenomenon, not only because that struggle for freedom emerged right under totalitarianism seen after the death of Stalin, but it was itself a form of theory. And it crowded the globe.

What is to be done now that the 1970s are upon us and the Movement ones begin to recognize that (1) theory is not directly, however, that one of these must be engaged in the battle where which cannot be lumped together as if there were no class divisions that would help uproot the system, and (2) that all the revolutionary forces — worker, Black, women's liberation, youth — must seek unity, not for unity's sake, but for establishing new principles, new human relations, new creativity?

The vast mass of cultural of Puerto Rican youth in Newark is counting the losses. Ford should listen to them sufficiently to know that the masses have no intention of putting up endlessly with slum unemployment, deepening recession, runaway inflation, and retribution on Black liberation. A new epoch is on the horizon, and the deepest layers are preparing to cross that threshold into a new social order that is of their own making.

This article was excerpted from the Perspectives Report delivered to the Convention of News & Letters Committees on Aug. 22. Copies of the complete report are available from News & Letters for 50 cents. See ed., page 2.
TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

Dear P.B.

It is and, indeed, that no abyss is the theoretic void which has persisted in the revolutionary movement ever since the death of Lenin in 1924 that the moment there is mention of Hegelian dialectics—the ground that made possible Marx's discovery of a whole new content of thought, Historical Materialism, which, in turn, made necessary a return to that self-movement which Marx had declared to be the "source of all dialectics"—at that moment even an independent Marxism like you has lost the three old, very old, red herrings: 1.) Hegel's re-institution of "theology", 2.) Hegel's failure to understand "the real meaning of Napoleon on the white horse", after which comes the clincher, 3.) "where was Hegel's practice?"—so that if ever there were the reason Marx continued grappling with the Hegelian dialectics throughout his life as a proletarian revolutionary.

You, however, go over your merry way, violating both philosophy and history, not only by inquiring the reason for Lassalle's "going to bistre" to Hegel's Eagle, but bringing your philanderer up to date as well as "personalizing" it by further dragging in me and Marx, writing that Hegel's "horror" at Merot and Bakhuev "is somewhat the same as yours against Marx."

NO PLACE FOR PSEUDO POINTS

Were I as interested as you in seeing totally irrelevant, pseudo-points, I could end the discussion right here by simply showing my "horror"—and this one, too—is real and is of today—at your profoundly supplyng revolutionary red color to that state-capitalist ruler continuing to mouth Marxist phrases while sifting out the red carpet for every leader from Nixon to Brezhnev. After he had turned his Army loose against the Chinese proletariat whom he called "economists," for daring to

—P.B., the German revolutionary who wrote the critique "Why Hegel? Why Now?" that appeared in N&L, August-September, 1974,

ask for better conditions of labor, and against the sheng Wu-len*, the youth rebels who took him at his word that "it was right to rebel," and worked to develop commons in the manner of the Paris Commune, the form of workers' rule that Marx recognized as the "dictatorship of the proletariat." It is, high time, indeed, seriously to get down to working out the inner connection between Marx's theory of revolution and Hegelian dialectics.

It is high time, instead of counterposing endlessly Feuerbach's materialism as "the superior" of Hegel's idealism, that we understand fully why Marx, despite the fact that Feuerbach helped the Young Hegelians (Marx included) "complete" the break with Hegel's Idealism, credited Hegel, not Feuerbach, with developing "the active side of self-developing "subject.""

"The chief defect of all historicist-existing materialism (that of Feuerbach included) is that this, reality, can be seen only in the form of the objects ... not subjectively. Hence, in contradistinction to materialism, the active side was developed absolutely by idealism ..."

Of course, neither Feuerbach's materialism, nor Hegelian Idealism, understood proletarian praxis, "revolutionary," "practical-critical activity." That was Marx.**

*"Sheng Wu-len is the acronym for the 20 organizations comprising the Inner Provinces Peasant Revolutionary Great Alliance Committee which issued their Manifesto: "Whither China?" asking that the "Cultural Revolution" not remain "a revolution of dismaying officials, nor a movement of dragging out people, nor purely cultural revolution, but a revolution in which one class overthrows another." Calling the Maoist leadership "the Red capitalist class", the manifesto concluded: "Let the new bureaucratic bourgeoisie tremble before the true socialist revolution that shakes the world! What the proletariat can lose in this revolution is only their claims, what they can win is the whole world." (See the manifesto quoted in Chapter 5, "The Thought of Mao Tse-tung" in Philosophy and Revolution, pages 270 to 182.)


(Continued)
see not only abolition of capitalist private property by communism, but the second negativism: "Only by the transcendence of this modality, and does there arise positive humanism beginning from itself."

You're absolutely right when you write: "Concrete Humanism starts with Marx, with nobody else! But that doesn't explain why Marx himself, after his own discovery and the actual class struggles which marked the true "non-speculatively"-expressed history of mankind's development; after the 1848 revolution followed by his theory of permanent revolution; after the development of all his economic theories of value and surplus-value and collapse of capitalism "rewriting", in that genuine's magnificent work, the Grundrisse, to such Hegelian language as "absolute movement of becoming" to describe the proletariat's "Aufhebung"; and, finally, in the second edition of his greatest theoretical work, Capital, published after the Paris Commune, when the greatest civil war in his lifetime showed "freely associated men" finally stripping "abolition of commodity" Marx first then made crystal clear that the productive capital-labor relationship assumes the fantastic form of an exchange relationship between things (commodities) because that is "what it really is" at the point of production-recitation of labor. This phenomenon becomes Nolens, however, far from transforming us all into "one-dimensional men," first concretizes "the quest for universality" as the proletariat taking destiny into its own hands, so that the greatest achievement of the Paris Communards, as he tells us in The Civil War in France, is simply, "its own working existence."

HEGEL CRUCIAL TO MARX AND LENIN

I can hear you grinning your teeth in impatience at my repeating such "ABCs" of Marxism. No doubt you believe that your reference to 1848 as "the decisive year" has already (and more cogently and surely briefly) done away with all of that. But I believe this to be a mistake in that letter to Weydensoyer Marx had developed from class struggle through the dictatorship of the proletariat to a classless society. Why then do you persist in (1) separating philosophy from economics so that even when we agree on a point, such as the still unexplained greatness of Marx's "Fecondity of Commodity," you say it in order "to prove the need to dispense with Hegel?" (2) continue further to degrade Hegel to one of many philosophers—"Spinoza, Herder, etc."? I love especially the "etc." which shows just how intellectualize a revolution can become once he begins allowing for "cultural" although you knew very well that, whatever other philosophers and utopian socialists and "materialists" Marx "learned from," one and only one—Hegel—he not only "came from," but said the task of the proletariat was "to realize" his philosophy, i.e., freedom. And (3) claim that the reason for Lenin's studying Hegel, in the midst of the holocaust of World War I, was because he "spoke in revolutions that tell for Kautsky, etc.—like he, himself, did before he had studied Hegel.

Now supposing that was true—it wasn't, as he fought those politically, not "philosophically," and for those The Regenieur Kautsky suffered—but supposing it was true, how could that possibly explain how Lenin in his Will summed up a lifetime in the revolutionary movement, leaving as a legacy what to look for to extend the Russian Revolution to a world scale? How could what you say show why Lenin who had initiated the Great Divide within revolutionary Marxism, philosophically as well as in activity—and, remember, I am not talking of Stalin or Trotsky, or Shengary-Kamen, but of Bakhin who, Lenin says, "is not only a most valuable and major theorist of the Party (Bolshevik, not "Kautsky, etc."")—why he is also rightly considered the favorite of the whole Party—draw the considered conclusion: "But his theoretical views can be classified as fully Marxist only with great reserve, for there is something schismatic about him (he has never made a study of dialectics, and, I think, never fully understood it)."

No, my dear P.R., what you say is far from any truth about the Hegelian dialectic. Where you single out Hegel's Logic as that which is supposed to have led Lavalle to Bolshevism, Lenin writes: "It is impossible fully to grasp Marx's Capital, and especially its first chapter, if you have not studied through and understood the whole of Hegel's Logic." Where you make it a matter of "sticking" only, and that of Hegel "not much more than for studying Spinoza, Herder, etc." Lenin made it a question of both with Bluhemberg, who followed Spinoza, and above all with himself, as a theoretic preparation for proletarian revolution, breaking with co-Bolsheviks who did not understand either "self-determination of the Idea," or the "self-determination of intentions" as "the dialectic of history." And when one stress "the end of philosophy started with Marx," both Marx and Lenin considered it was first necessary "to realize it"—AND THAT, IT IS TRUE, COULD NOT BE DONE BY HEGEL BUT BY PROLETARIAN REVOLUTIONARIES who, HOWEVER, UNDERSTOOD "SELF-DEVELOPING SUBJECT" AND PRACTICED IT.

That's what I am trying to do in carrying out philosophy as action. Having so heatedly rushed to criticize "Why Hegel? Why Now?" (Part I, of Philosophy and Revolution) by just the title, may I now ask you to read the book, especially Part II?
TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

(EDITOR'S NOTE: From the paper on Hegel's "Absolute Idea: A New Beginning," which Raya Dunayevskaya delivered to the Hegel Society of America conference at Georgetown University on Nov. 8 we have excerpted the section on the relationship of the movement from practice to philosophy. It is a critique of philosophers, including those who consider themselves Marxists, specifically Theodor Adorno and his philosophical legacy, Negative Dialectics (Schocken Press, New York, 1973), in contrast to the Czech philosopher, Karl Kuklík's, The Dialectic of the Concrete.

HEGEL'S ABSOLUTES never were a series of ascending ivory towers. Revolutionary transformation is imminent in the very form of thought. As we saw from the Absolute Idea chapter, the uplifting force was creativity of practice. By the time we reach the meditated final result, Absolute Mind—the absolute negation that was the moving force in Loge, in Nature, in Geist where we saw them as concrete stages of human freedom—there no longer is any difference between theory and practice. This is why one age, which has been witness to a movement from practice of two long decades (ever since the death of Stalin lifted the iron from the back of the masses in Eastern Europe), can best understand Hegel's Absolutes.

To this writer, Hegel's genius is lodged, precisely, in the fact that his "journey of discovery" becomes one endothesis process of discovery for us, and the us includes both Marx's new condition of thought of materialistic dialectics, and Hegel scholars, and the movement from practice that was itself a form of theory since its spontaneously discovered the power of thought along with its physical might.

This writer has followed very closely this movement of revolution since June 17, 1933, and saw in it a quest for universality because she had already discerned in the dialectic movement of the three final synthetisms in Absolute Mind a new point of departure in the Idea and in the movement from practice.

THIS MOVEMENT from practice hardly had the ear of contemporary Hegelians, "orthodox" or Marxist, as witness the attacks and Left to Right in the famous Frankfurt School, Theodor Adorno, whose very reason for being, for thinking, for acting was Dialectics, that is to say, for negation of what is. He entitled the summation of his life's thought which he certainly considered his intellectual legacy, Negative Dialectics. This, however, is only to do with dialectic of negativity, least with concept of Subject, with which Hegel distinguished his philosophy from that of all other philosophers, who left the search for truth at Substance only. As "counteremotional" by Marx for proletarian class, Subject is supposed to have been accepted also by Adorno, but, again, he keeps his distance and originality locked into what he calls Negative Dialectics.

From the very start of the Preface of his work, Adorno informs us that the positive is the negative, the negation of the negation, is the enemy. This book seeks to free dialectics from such affirmative traits without reducing its determinancy.

NATURALLY ADORNO also keeps his distance from "positivism" and the voluntarism of the knighted Karl Popper of the infamous "Hegel and fascism" school. Nevertheless, Adorno very nearly out of nowhere intonates some sort of synthesis between it and absolute negativity. "Genocide is the absolute negation... Auschwitz confirmed the phantasm of pure identity as death... Absolute negativity is in plain sight and has ceased to surprise anyone..."

By "nearly out of nowhere" I naturally do not mean Auschwitz wasn't the reality of fascism, nor do I mean only the ruggedness and shock of introducing the subject matter in the climax to the book, "Meditations on Metaphysics." Rather I mean it is "wrong," that is to say totally Hegelian, non-dialectical, from his own point of view of an adult lifetime devoted to fighting fascist "ideology" as the very opposite of Hegelian dialectics, his very death in Nazi Germany. Perhaps a better word than "wrong" would be Adorno's own awareness:

"naive."

I mean that, as late as 1937, in Aspects of the Hegel, Dialectic, Adorno was almost defending even subject-object identity: "Subject-object cannot be dissolved as mere extravagance of logical abstraction... In seeking through the latter as mere subjectivity, we have already passed beyond the speculative idealism... negation, if it is genuine, and more than simple duplication of the subjectivity, must be the subject's objectivity." And indeed in Negative Dialectics he reiterates the same truth when he writes that, despite the fact that Hegel "defines" subjectivity, "he accomplishes the opposite as well, as insight into the subject as a self-manifesting objectivity."

WHY, THEN, the vulgar reduction of absolute negativity? There is the real tragedy of Adorno (and the Frankfurt School): the infallible one-dimensionality of thought, a once "gives up" subject, once one does not listen to the voices from below and so they certainly were dead and clear and demanding in that decade of the mid-1930s to the mid-1960s; once one returns to the...
Ivory tower and reduces one's (his) purpose to "the purpose of discussing key concepts of philosophic discipl
plains and centrally interrelating in those disciplines . . . " (p. xii). Irresistibly come the next step, the sub
stitution of a permanent critique not merely of "absolute negativity" but of "permanent revolution."

Now, whether the enduring relevance of Hegel has stood the test of time because of the devotion and rigor of
analyst of Hegel scholars, or because from below arose a movement for freedom that was fol-
lowed by new cognition studies, there is no doubt that because Absolute Negativity signifies transformation of
reality, the dialectic of contradiction and totality of crises, the dialectic of liberation, Hegel comes to life at
critical points of history which Hegel himself char
acterized as "birthtime of history."

There were Marxist scholars, revolutionary dissidents, who built on new ground. Where a scholar from
the East like Maurer was preoccupied with Hegel's con
cept of where to end, the Czechoslovak philosopher, Karel Kosel, was preoccupied with where to begin anew.
Of the East European studies that accompanied the re
volts, and revolved around Marx's Humanism, especially Marx's "Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic," one of the
most rigorous studies was Karel Kosel's The Dialectic of the Concrete.

Not were these serious studies limited to the "East."
As Frantz Fanon saw it, the African struggle for free-
dom was "not a treatise on the universal, but the unity
affirmation of an original idea propounded as an abso-
lute." There is no doubt, of course, that once action
supersedes the subjectivity of purpose, the unity of
theory and practice is the form of life out of which
emerge totally new dimensions. To this writer this is the "speed" that the ending of Science of Logic in the
absolute as new beginning, the self-bringing forth of
liberty.

WHEN PHILOSOPHERS LEARN to aschew criticisms
then the unity of theory and practice, of absolute as new
beginning won't remain abstract desires, or mere will
but philosophy becomes action. In his re-examination of
Hegel, Professor Filligar was right when he stated:
Hegel's existence "can seem arid and false to those who
see nothing mysterious and godlike in the facts of human
thought." But isn't it equally true that philosophers who
stand only in terror before revolution not only do not
"comprehend", if, they cannot fully comprehend revolu-
tion in thought? And Hegel did revolutionize philosophy.
Deep U.S. recession and the myriad global crises

by Raya Dunayevskaya, Chairwoman, News and Letters Committees

The new year has brought the world face to face with outright famines in Asia and Africa, recessions circling the globe, the sixth and deepest of the post-war recessions being right here, in the mildest and richest of all ruling powers, the U.S.A.

The newly-created Middle East Oil Cartel, far from being free of crises, including class struggles that undermine the whole structure, is exactly where war threatens to break out. Moreover, on the horizons looms not only still another Arab-Israeli war, nor only awed fantasia like the Shah of Iran, stirring about with the grand illusion of restoring the old Persian empire, and globally at that. Gomulka diplomacy extends especially from the real world Goliath, U.S. capitalism, not remotely armed to overrule it.

It would be futile to reduce these threats to mere contingency views for only the worst imaginable of situations—“implantation of institutional democracies.” A Third World War could only be nuclear, would be truly final, the end of civilizations as we’ve known it. No matter how stupid, therefore, talk of “contingencies” sounds, we must coldly and deeply and with utmost urgency examine “contingencies” as capitalist realities.

Let’s look not alone at the intra-imperialistic rivalries, nor, no matter how glittering the gold, at the global postures of the Middle East Oil Cartel, nor at the divisions within the ruling classes within each country. Instead, let’s begin the deepest contradictions that are everywhere beginning and ends—production.

Capitalism, private and state, never could solve basic contradictions, knowing only how to go from crises to wars and back again.

Unemployment and Political Shannonigans

There are moving masses not only in the poor, technologically underdeveloped lands, but also in the richest, super-industrialized country in the world, U.S.A., and that right after the GNP hit the trillion-dollar mark. All too obviously, GNP is not national wealth. Buffett “shilloubles” like unemployment insurance and Social Security may have convinced the loosed econocrats that a deep recession is not as bad as a depression. But, as witness the disaffection and retribution in any unemployment line, the Black marches, and the UAW demonstrations, the “Great Recession” and the “Great Depression,” the unemployed will not forever allow the capitalists to let the whole weight of their exploitative, systematic fall on their backs.

At this moment, when even the Herbert Hoover mentality of President Ford has had to give way to the reality that not inflation but unemployment is Enemy No. 1, here is where lies the truth: “average” unemployment is 7.1 percent, which means nearly seven million people out of work. Every industrial city, moreover, knows how farcical is this average. Detroit, for example, has a 12.4 percent rate of unemployment. This too below the real depth of recession, since in the “sister city,” that is to say, among blacks, unemployment is at the abysmal depth of depression—20 percent.

This startling truth has barely penetrated the thick skulls either of the Democrats who hurried to try to upstage the President by revealing their “program” Jan. 13, or the Republican President who upstaged himself by “going public” that same evening.

Finally, on Jan. 15, came the formal State of the Union address. From the mountain of public and months of work, trying to get a “consensus” among his battleworn allies, came forth a little mouse—a 12 percent rebate on taxes paid in 1974, that awful year in which no doubt everyone has already chalked up at least that much in debt.

The Decapitated State of the Union

The pig in the sky about “putting all our people to work” rests on (1) the extension of a lump investment tax credit of 12 percent for two years to Big Business, and (2) taxes on oil and home heating fuel which is supposed to cost government $2 billion and will supposedly get fed into expanded production. In fact, it only shows, on one hand, the total uncertainty for the people from whom it will take back in higher prices a great deal more than it “gives” in tax rebate. The only time the cool Mr. Ford’s voice rose to a crescendo was when he ordered Congress not to raise federal expenditures by more than five percent for any social legislation, promising to veto all such enactments.

On the other hand, Ford’s program, all too obviously, will neither assure “conservation of energy,” nor create jobs. What Ford knew before he spoke, but we didn’t learn until the following day, was the highest production (which includes, of course, the closing down of refiners) in the last quarter of 1973 showed the steepest drop in 30 years. This 8.1 percent drop in production, together with the biggest rise in inflation—12.2 percent—brings us back to the black days as World War II ended, 1945.

The depth of the economic crisis, which increased the president’s desire to get away from it all without any concern for the American people, sent him back to attacking the Arab Middle East, this time, in “mumbo jumbo,” that is to say, neither disclosing his gunboat diplomacy nor specifying it is in the Middle East he was talking about. This hardly bid the fact that he was bluming the quadrupled oil price for nothing short of putting world trade itself and the whole monetary structure “in jeopardy.” Further: “At stake is the future of industrialized democracy.”

The New Gold Circle

Everyone who needs a gallon of gas (as well as that gunboat diplomat, Henry Kissinger, whose preoccupation is playing the global political power game) is well aware of the new Gold Circle of oil price, a political weapon to force “everyone” to be pro-Arab and anti-Israel in the October 1973 Arab-Israeli war soon
gave way, however, to creation of a new Gold Circle in global wealth as quadrupled oil prices replaced the old empire. At the same time also began the dream that this dramatic shift in wealth would also mean a shift in political power to new limits — the Arab-Israeli syndrome.

Although this egotistical shift in wealth was not rooted in expanded production of oil, much less of industry; although the great powers — the two superpowers — the U.S. and Russia — cut for world domination; and although it had nowhere near the population that enabled a China of 800 million souls to try to make a triangular rather than bi-polar world militarily, the game of power politics was unleashed.

Let's take another look at the Shah of Iran, who now has the biggest howitzer army in the world, the largest naval base in the Persian Gulf, the most sophisticated missile system in the Third World. Isn't the situation Syria exercises on the Shah the fact that Russia armed it with SCUDS? Isn't that fact that the Persian emperor has suddenly become an Arab, and from the land of the pyramids, on Jan. 11 in a joint communiqué with Sadat, called for "total" Israeli withdrawal from occupied Arab land and affirmed "the right of the Palestinian people to their homeland and the Arab character of Jerusalem."

At the same time, he remains the best customer of the American merchants of death who have sold 60 F-4 jet fighters for $750 million to Saudi Arabia. Iran has purchased $1 billion worth over the past several years. And this has stopped now, that he is buying so many arms from France and pre-paying with a cool billion. On the contrary, he is busy building the biggest ultrabase in the Middle East to accommodate an air force that by the end of the 1970s will have more fighter-bombers than any member of NATO except the U.S.

The Gold Circle and National Chauvinism

The Shah now has a number of options: to accelerate the building of the key SB-600 helicopter school to teach Iranians how to fly their fleet of more than 400 helicopters. (Last year, Iran supplied more than 2.5 billion worth of planes, helicopters and hardware from the U.S.)

All Iran has to do is to buy more F-4s and other modernized French and German nuclear reactors. Now that India has shown how an inter-national chauvinism infects the co-existence of farms alongside nuclear bomb, there is no need to emphasize that what is sought for "peaceful" use is made into a nuclear weapon.

The International Institute for Strategic Studies has announced that by 1988 the all-prodigious countries will have a liquid surplus of $400 billion! And we can add this Arab potential to what is now already a state status, followed by the UN welcome for him, and we can easily get stoked into the global myth of the Gold Circle. Therefore we forget the objective reality of capitalist global power, on the one hand, and the real forces of revolution within each country, on the other hand.

What does need serious examination is the pull this Gold Circle has had in bringing about a division within U.S. capitalism.

The Split Within

The deep division within the industrial-military complex between those who support Kissinger for a Ford-Kissinger foreign policy in the Middle East, and those who hold we can do business with OPEC, no matter how high the oil prices, has reached a new stage. No longer is this opposition to the Administration policy limited to the American labor who always preferred to do business because their profits were so high, their exploitation of the oil resources so total, and their anti-Semitism so deep. And, while, as General Brown's anti-Semitic remarks showed openly enough, and the reform in present in the upper military echelons, too, there is a radicalism among the capitalist opponents of Kissinger diplomacy which nevertheless "does not exclude" military intervention if new conditions "change" the "internationalized" world.

Thus, the editor of Business Week sounded very near this line like the similarly revolutionarily anti-Vietnam War slogan "Hell, no, we won't go!" when he wrote an open letter that he will not send his son "to die for oil!" An "intellectual" campaign with an air of great "objectivity" has been launched. Publicity in the daily press has been given to the main article in the January issue of Foreign Affairs, "How Can the World Afford OPEC Oil?"

The prestigious quarterly lists five authors for the article representing an intellectual community virtually excluding the globe, from Iran to West Germany, and from the U.S. to Japan, not to mention "many individuals from other OPEC and OECD countries who were consulted."

It turns out to express the Iranian view, as is natural for the chairman of the Industrial Development Bank of Iran, Khadad Mohammadbak, who is his chief author. Nevertheless, its importance lies in the fact that it is not only the view of OPEC in general and Iran in particular, but also of international capital that wants to do business with the oil blackmailers. Moreover, these are not limited to the U.S. who has had for "doing business with Hitler" by letting him rule Europe.

The Ford Administration, and the intra-capitalist opponents do not disagree on the overriding class necessity to do anything, anything at all, to stop protestation revolution that they all call "assuring world stability." The disagreement, and the failing apart, is over how to assure that it is the U.S. that will do the ordering about; the assurance that civil wars and the global domination of any single crisis when there are myriad of them as things begin to fall apart when, as President Ford tells us, the "future" can be assured only if there is created "a new energy stability for the world."

Obviously, Ford-Kissinger still believe in Pax Americana, as though that is the "American century!"

Fox Americans and Western Europe

Just how the Ford Administration means to assure "a new energy stability in the world" is by no means exhausted by protestant diplomacy directed alone to the Middle East. From a secret report being prepared for the Administration for summer, we can see what it needs: for the rest of the world — "fast shrinking" military intere-

The question most probably Latin America and nothing short of "the collapse of Indian democracy." For reasons best known to itself, the imperial globo "bystanders" of the draft report is called "The Future (1)

(1) See Kissinger's "Exclusive Interview" with Business Week, 1/23/75.

(2) Jack Anderson has gotten hold of a summation, and published it on Jan. 9, 1975.
While it is true that it's not only a question of the three or four million tons of food needed today, but also a $50-million-ton deficit that will grow to 100 million tons in less than a decade, that hardly excuses the billions-of-dollars-rich America not increasing its meager contributions to try to correct the world famine.

The tragedy was expressed in precise terms only by the Transnational Institute which wrote: "Hunger is caused by plunder, not by scarcity."

There is no way to stop such madness except through social revolution, upgrading the whole system. Therein lies the solution, the creative force arising from such disintegration in the system and late-stage capitalists, inter-capitalist rivalries, provided revolutions do not fall into the trap of "taking sides" like "the inner wheel" or "the outer wheel," and provided the theoretic zeal gets filled.

The Left — Still the Need for Revolution

The Shah can hardly pass for a revolutionary any more than the multi-national oil cartel can pass for a "trade union" just because the new oil bosses claim it is "just that." The Shah's first counter-revolution, engineered by him for the CIA and for that reason successful, was in 1953. Though he had lost the throne because the people had put the Tudeh Party in power and the Prime Minister Mossadegh had nationalized oil, he is now using this same fact to try to restore the old Persian empire.

Since then, the overthrow of Mossadegh and driving to an underground existence of the Tudeh where they could withstand the torture, murderous secret police, SAVAK, Iran has become a totalitarian police state. As for the new oil oligarchs, they own the third of all people in Tehran—and the countryside is much worse off than the capital—is less than $500 per person a year.

In face of all these well-known facts, how could the Left support a man whose government has sent troops to Korea, through the UN? Moreover, it is not only Arab rulers and OPEC countries as well as PLO leaders but the so-called Left of the West that continue to support this regime. Nowadays it appears sufficient to be "anti-American-imperialist" and "anti-Zionist" to be considered "progressive," even "Left," without any question either about international procedures or policies generally. Quite the contrary. Adherence of a type of "anti-Americanism" go out of their way to repeat the Shah's baldfaced lies to the whole truth.

Thus, the New York Review of Books quotes approvingly the Shah's statement that "22 years of cheap food made Europe what it is and Japan what it is," not to mention, of course, U.S.A.

And what has happened to the simple truth that labor produces all wealth. Not just its own wages, not just all the products in the marketplace, but all the profits coming from the unpaid hours of labor? Isn't it still a fact that surplus value is derived from labor, be the rulers private capitalists, feudal kingdoms, or the state-capitalists calling themselves Communist ruling Russia and China?

— (3) Transnational Institute, 1520 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. whose pamphlet, World Hunger: Causes and Remedies, is free.


— (cost: $4)
Why is the myth of gold being separated from production? Why is the oligopolistic monopolization of power and profit so repressive? How can the illusion of profit be maintained? What is the true state of the U.S. economy, and what does it mean for the future of American society?

So regressive are some of the "left," so perverted their internationalism which is narrowed to one or the other in the post-Soviet sphere, that the only "unifying slogan" is anti-Zionism.

Thus, in one of the demonstrations against Dayan at American University in Washington, D.C., one of the slogans chanted with much fervor was "Zionism, out of Iran." Is Zionism, rather than the Shah, keeping the masses half-starved? Is Zionism, rather than the Shah, keeping the masses in jail? Is Zionism, rather than the Shah, reviving the spirit of the old Persian empire, extended militarily and geographically?

If Americans manage to act decent, not to know that by Zionism in Iran Mao actually means Russia on its borders, Russia being the common enemy of Mao and the Shah, then the Trotskyists, for whom Russia, "though degenerate," remains a workers' state, cannot play the dumb game. The Trotskyists' stance is too opportunistic, too naive to be "for" the new left's anti-Zionism to separate themselves from the demonstrators, even when anti-Zionism finds in anti-Zionism a useful cover.

The Maoists and Trotskyists are not, of course, alone in this, Open anti-Semitism like that of the Greek Bishop who preaches every reference to Klassen as "the German Jewish Secretary of State" is tolerated by the Socialist Andreas Papandreou who, along with Dr. Vasos Lyanos of Cr. S.P., calls for any actions of the PLO as it indeed only terrorists can rightfully represent the Palestinians and their struggle for freedom and self-determination.

This is not to say that there is anything progressive about Zionism, especially as it is practiced in Israel. Nor is it to deny that, consistently, Israel has confined its second-class citizenship even to those Palestinians who accept Israeli citizenship, much less to the refugees as Palestinians: their rights to self-determination must be recognized. But it is not the PLO terrorism and assassinations at Kibbutz Shoma, Macao, Shamir, Nahr al-Ji, Be'er al-Gov, the Caravan village of Elblives, and then whitehats the highly religious Arab's sudden calls for a "separate state" as if that were "socialism," is to strive national liberation.

Israel has a right to exist, though it is state-capitalist as it is our whole age, which needs to be torn up, root and branch. But this uprooting can only be done by social revolution, and that begins in class struggles within the country, as much of the genuine left in Israel is doing right now in its opposition to its own rulers. In class struggles and opposition to the austerity program on their backs.

There has been recognition of just how conservative revolution is the claim to "revolutionary Third World" on the part of the "new UN majority, Arab led." Thus the recent action of the UNECOSO in excluding Israel from "regional" actions in Paris has brought widespread opposition from committed intellectuals who have fought the flight of Palestinian freedom.

Jean-Paul Sartre (and many others signed the statement) wrote: "If Israel has been placed neither in Asia (as was Australasia), nor in Europe (as was Canada), this means she belongs nowhere; namely, Israel doesn't exist." Just because the so-called Third World "has decided that Israel does not have a right to exist . . . it's the extermination process perfected by the totalitarian systems of the 20th century." Thus, it should be added, cannot lead to anything but Hitler's "Final Solution."

Whether or not an Arab-Israeli war breaks out in Spring; whether or not the PLO becomes the only symbol of Palestinian resistance; whether or not a world holocaust continues to threaten not alone in that area, but in the struggle between super-powers, China included—where the struggles cannot end in within each country, where the masses in action will be the only ones capable of ending the horror of nuclear madness.

It is here then where the deepest recession sets in, where the Black Revolution reminds us every day that it will start anew, where the new wave of revolution—the poor and youth and unemployed as well as the workers who are fighting for the battle with capital, and arming themselves with reason as well as force—where the struggles will develop.

Let's begin by regarding our heads as well as our class solidarity instead of indulging any state power, be it U.S., Russia or China, much less the Gold Circle suddenly identified as Third World. And in every activity, be it at the point of production, the unemployment lines, Women's Liberation struggles, or playing the hand of the government diplomacy of Ford-Kissinger, let's not separate the strategies for freedom from the strategies of liberation. Philosophy and revolution are inseparable if we are not once again to end with absurd spontaneity mass revolt.
How new is China's new constitution?

As if it's 11 years old, you've had never imagined. Chou En-lai delivered his report where he was not to. In 1964, and it all led to making China, a new Five Year Plan, into a "powerful, modern" country. That feature he cited there was in percentage terms (which you didn't really know what, physically, was being produced and what will be the reality at the end of the Five Year Plan). The great successes he spoke of must have jarred the audience, at least the top leaders, who were of "Document 5" (which spelled-out detailed conditions of industrial ets and workers wages.)

Nevertheless, the continuity between Chou's report to the Congress in 1964 and the present is important, not as much because it is "moderate," as against Mao's Great Leap Forward in 1956 and the Cultural Revolution, 1966-69, not to mention the mini-Cultural Revolution (Continued on Page 7).

[NOTE: Document 5 has not yet appeared here, but a review of it appears in Newsweek, 9/7/60.]

---
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IN TWO WORLDS

By Rave D. Soneoka

Author of PHILANTHROPY AND REVOLUTION and Marxism and Freedom

For the first time in a decade — during which nothing short of the planned eruption of the "Cultural Revolution" and the planned loss of a Chief of State, President Liu Shao-chi, took place without the National People's Congress participating in any way — the Fourth Congress convened in Peking this January. For the first time since the first draft of the new Constitution was proposed — but had obviously been dropped since Mao's "closest comrade-in-arms," his designated successor, Lin Piao, died unnaturaly, the name of Mao no-where appears in the present Constitution.

For the first time in two decades since this governing body, which is supposed to be the highest organ of state power, first met and adopted a Constitution in 1954, it was "amended" by its reduction in 135 articles to 30. The Constitution's brevity was by no means a mere "convenience" any more than was the abolition of the post of the president. The substantive of Standing Committee for the post of a single president and the compression of the contents of the new Constitution both attest to the quality of the revisions, not in very opposite direction. Let's look into their opposites.

On the one hand, we see, for the first time, the open admission of the totalitarian nature of the state. The "Standing Committee" is not only subordinate to "the leadership of the Communist Party," but also part of it and the character of the party is the sole, supreme authority in the government, in the Army, as well as "in all matters of superstructure." (1)

On the other hand, there is the complete coverage of the class nature of the state, without so much as a single reference being made to the original Constitution, adopted in 1956, which openly declared China to be "state-capitalist." (2) The "amended" Constitution declares China (1) the critical phase of the Constitution was published, under the title, in the New York Times, 7/25/64)

(2) In the Shanghai Commissariat of Justice, as we can carry out

We are told to be "a socialist state of the dictatorship of the pro-

lelars..."

We are willing to close our eyes to the forced identity of these two opposers — the dictatorship of the proletariat, a transitional state, and sociallism, as achieved class-less society — can such world shaking, historic stages be accomplished by a mere stroke of the pen? Has the reality been so readily transformed?

MAOISM WITHOUT MAO: CHOU EN-LAI

Nothing could be further from the truth. The reality is that, just as Stalinism is flourishing without Stalin in Russia, so is Maoism without Mao's name. And I do not mean only because he is still alive, is still the Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. No. I mean that his "philosophy," "Mao-Teaching Thought," does, indeed, underpin the whole structure of China.

Whether or not Mao's ideas will, like the hairs of Stalin, run like rats from a sinking ship once Mao dies, nothing fundamental will have changed as long as Mao-Teaching Thought governs the economic base as well as the political and cultural superstructure. All we have to do to see this is to listen to the Premier and "moderate" Chou En-lai's Report to the Congress as well as carefully read that new Constitution.

I'm not referring to such superficialities as Chou repeating his speeches with quotations from Mao as well as referring to him by name as "our great leader." No. I'm referring to something a great deal more basic — the three fundamental principles of capitalistic production which appear in the Constitution and govern Chou's report: class struggle, production and ever more production, and scientific socialism. According Marx's analysis of capitalistic production as "three great revolu-
tional movements" changes nothing whatever in labor's exploitation at the point of production, much less in the incessant halls of science producing nuclear bombs.

Sources through various forms of state capitalism. State capitalism under the control of a state led by the working class, and in the hands of the "American" (the emerging of the First Republic of the First Working People's Congress in the People's Republic of China, Foreign Language Press, Peking, 1955.)
"criticize tendency, criticize Lin" campaign—had become the class nature of China sustained the same throughout all of these periods. Thus, though the 1959 report, which tried initiating a new Five-Year Plan, was "interrupted" by the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" (which they couldn't control, once it got going, until 1965), the motive force of the society remained Stalin's perversion of Marx's great principle. "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work," into the exploitative principle. "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work..."

Far from the Cultural Revolution having been a truly social revolution, it was actually Mao thinking through disciplining his co-leaders, i.e., consider results to be "enemies No. 1." Now that he has had the "collective leadership" to operate on that basis, the rehabilitation of many in the party headquarters, that "broad, but lean, was not in Mao's interest. Whether it is that young Wang, whom Mao had labeled at the Twenty-First Communist Party Congress in 1977, or the old, Tao, whom the Cultural Revolution had called a "rebel" and "traitor," but who is now "Chairman Mao's Deputy, Chairman of State Affairs," telling the masses that they must do as his Chairman says: "Work hard," and "dig, dig, dig, dig..."

What was exciting and what was terrifying was how the "happened outside the Congress." "From 1959 and work..." pages occurred in various influential journals in China. The Constitution is trying to fact that, really, by "proletarianize... in China. Judging by the very fact declarations of the "new" and "modern..." leadership has issued officially. It is clear that their interpretation of "continuous revolution" is endless labor discipline with statements in Red Flag and People's Daily, showing that those who do not practice labor discipline are trying "to seize one of the sources of democracy to sabotage the united leadership of the party and the proletarian dictatorship."

What, then, in Moscow with or without Mao, and with "Chairman Mao" as the new Triumvirate to execute the new Constitution?

(TO BE CONCLUDED NEXT ISSUE)
PART II

The pure Marxism that governs the new Constitution and its very, very old "new leadership"1 is Mao's most unoriginal and most original philosophic contribution: "On Consequences," which rested on substituting for state contradictions, the relationships between economic base and political superstructure and so equalizing the two as to make his "superstructure" (i.e., his political line of the moment) every bit as decisive as the production relationship.2

Ever since the 10th Communist Party Congress in 1956, new and very important documents, the "new leadership"2 have finally become known in the West. Three sheds new, and in some cases, lengthy, on the whole question of the relationship between base and superstructure, which dresses in Lenin, along with Stalin, as Russian "emissaries" who "underestimate" the peasantry. Since the voluminous writings of Lenin on the peasantry, and the further development of the colonial question after the conquest of power, but Lenin to reflect the question of world revolution to the Orient — "if not through Berlin, then through Pakistan" — Mao could not possibly, not through the widest leap of nightmarish imagination, make such an accusation against Lenin. Here is how he tries nevertheless.

In 1956 — after the death of Stalin, but before Khrushchev's de-Stalinization in February 1956 — Mao embarked on his topic of fantasy collectivization and criticized the "left leadership" as "maximalist." In November 1956, the "new leadership" was in the "correct" solution: China has "correct" industrial development (be it industrial development led by cadres or cadres, or both) than any other country. In the Communist Party Congress, Mao is in the middle of a discussion about the "maxim" and the consequences. But not about the superstructure. Part of Mao's analysis is in "Long live the proletariat revolution!"

THE BOMB

In 1957, when Mao was in Moscow, he projected the Nebos the idea that the Third World, China repeatedly, had nothing to fear from nuclear terrorism since that would do away with "imperialism" and the civilization that would rise on its ruins would be "higher, this country is made up of "Maoist" workers.

No no, indeed, dared speak about it, and it remained secret, until first, a British trade union delegation heard about it and was not shocked into secrecy, and then the Sino-Israeli contract broke into the open, and the Russians never tired of referring to it. No matter what purpose the Russian Communist and the knowledge to the point in: Mao did say it, Mao did think it, Mao never deviated from that position. Indeed, this is precisely what accused the acceptance of state-capitalism (which calls "socialism under the dictatorship of the proletariat") as the next stage of humanity's development.

The only thing that is new now is that the documents that became known in 1957, which were meant for the elite of China during the Cultural Revolution, back up this view by quoting Mao as saying: "The Chinese history, our population has been destroyed by half, a golden time."

Is that what the "new leadership" means now as what, as Mao put it, "would throw the world clean of imperialism," after which we could rebuild again? And is this what leads the "New Left" in the West to consider Mao the revolutionary who shows "new revolution to revolution?"
State-capitalism and the dialectic

By Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION and Marxism and Freedom

Two reasons prompted me, on this year's Spring lecture tour on the East Coast, to talk on the relevance of the relationship of philosophy to political economy today. One was that the New York Union of Radical Political Economists (URPE) session stressed the fact that Marxist historians should tackle the problems of the day in the U.S. The other was the re-emerging Maoist Stalinism, especially amongst those specializing in China studies. To the latter subject I will return in a future column. Here is an abbreviated extract of my talk at the New School for Social Research.

I. Concepts

"The law of motion" that Marx had set out to discuss in his massive, rigorous study of the economic laws of capitalism and "its action" led to two other discoveries. One was that the law of concentration of capital could lead to all capital concentrated in the hands of "a single capitalist... or single capitalist society" but change nothing fundamental in the role of labor. Two was the creation of "new positions and new forces" from the absolute opposite of capital accumulation—workers' resistance at the point of production, the class struggles and passions for philosophy of liberation and reconstruction of society on totally new beginnings.

Until the first, classic Revisionism—Bernstein's Revolutionary Socialism—called for the removal of "the dialectic scaffolding" along with the indispensability of revolution, none questioned the integrality of economics and philosophy, history and revolution. This was hardly helped by Trotsky—who, alone, was left to fight Stalinism—nor dealing with the "distortions of the state's revolutionary and progressive role"; "the state's revolutionary role in society"; "the state's revolution
system through state intervention and thus hoped to keep the postwar revolution at bay. My study, from original Russian sources, was of the first three years and economic growth and degeneration of labor. This was on a totally different basis than either that of the anarchists who were quick to throw "state-capitalism" at the Russian workers' state from its very birth, or those like Lenin or Stalin who, in the shock at such a transformation into opposite, reverted to what totalitarianism was in feudalism, thus leaving room both for those who departed from Marxism as well as the early anarchists who, though, at any rate, "anarchistic collectivism" as an "unforeseen, ungratified reactionary part", nevertheless claimed it part of the "collective epoch of human history."

As distinct from this disunity of concepts, I retained the Marxist concept of history and the basic relationship between capital/labor to study the actuality of Russia and there found the operation of the most basic law of capitalism: the law of value. Stalinism was but the Russian name of the new stage of world capitalism: state-capitalism.

A new world stage of development did begin in 1922 with the victory of Mao, but it was not of the scope of the Russian Revolution but of the national liberation struggles. In any case, Mao himself originally called his state "state-capitalist", telling the Chinese masses not to worry because once they, through the Communist Party, held "the commanding heights", politically controlled, the state would be a "provisional one" only, leading to a classless society. But in fact anything but that happened: state-capitalism moulded Mao to change the conditions of labor for the masses, and their "superstructure", that is, to say, their freedom of thought and speech, as seen from the current debate in The Black Scholar. (See Black/Red contradiction). In China once a question of China than the debate on Russian state-capitalism was a debate of Russia. Rather, it is a question of world revolutionary perspective: especially of the American Revolution. The governing point is that it is not "socialism", but imperialism, American imperialism. The point is also that we will be entrapped in still another "feudalism" unless we begin with the new dialectic from practice which the masses established in the past two decades, whether it took the form of a liberation struggle from Communism: Russian Communism, as in East Europe, or from Western imperialism as it was in Africa, or from the Left within China, with the Sino-Weiden прежде, within the "Cultural Revolution" that called for a "genuine Party Communism" against the "red capitalistic, Chou En-lai", or, finally, the Black Revolution in the U.S., that eliminated the Free Speech Movement in academia as well as the totally involved youth in the anti-Vietnam war movement, thus giving rise to a whole new generation of revolutionaries, both as well as black, Women's Liberation as well as wildcats.

III. Challenges to Marxist Historians: the Movements from Practice and from Theory

All history is contemporary history and all truth concrete. What were Hegelian concepts of dialectics were removed from irony towers of thought and made into a new continent of thought and practice by Marx, who called his philosophy "a new Humanism" that united the ideal and the real, and saw history not as past as present and as being shaped by living men and women. There are no Marxes or Leonins today but we do have the maturity of the age and that movement from practice as itself a form of theory. To think that, as American Marxists, we can only talk of class struggle without participating in it, or talk "left" without mentioning the different tendencies, actually narrows Marxism from its world roots, and allows bourgeois ideology to prevail. This doesn't mean that we will not concentrate on American studies. The very opposite is true both of concepts and of reality. When we attempt to restate Marxism for our age, we study, in this age, be it the two-way road to revolution of Blacks in America and Blacks in Africa, or China's "New Economic Policy"; or the current deep recession, we cannot leave out the concepts of state-capitalism and the dialectics.

The dialectic is what makes us see the opposite in each unit and each unity and keeps us from the trap of one-dimensionality. Which is why Marx considered scientists as well as utopians "abstract materialists", and warned against "a materialism which eulogizes history and its process."

In this bicentennial year, as against the so-called objective historians, Marxist historians must dig both into the present and the past, yet merely expose that content inherent to the Declaration of Independence which has made an abstraction of freedom, but in opening the existential avenues for the second American revolution. Only by listening to the masses from below -- especially during these past two decades when all the fronts, from Black Revolution to anti-Vietnam war movement, from Third World and East European moves to Women's Liberation and Sheng Weiden, they far outdistanced theorecticians stuck in "dead pedantry" and one-dimensionality -- can Marxist historians bring about a totally new relationship of theory to practice and thereby bring to life what Marx called "the realization of philosophy", that is to say, make freedom a reality.
TWO WORLDS

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION and Marxism and Freedom

I am turning over my column this issue to a colleague who is a young Women’s Liberationist and who has sent me the following letter...

Dear Raya:

“Women’s Liberation has reached a new stage, both objectively and subjectively,” I write after your tour here last month. I meant that not only has women’s activity been great (as we can see from the lead article in April News & Letters), but there is also a real passion for philosophy in the air.

There seems to be feminists “study groups” all over, and a new interest in Marx, who was once rejected along with everything not brand new and exclusively woman.

But what impressed me especially were the new women who came to your lectures here. Their questions were so serious, and their affinity for the ideas of Marxist-Humanism so immediate, I felt that there must be conclusions drawn and new relationships begun.

There were mostly women at the Hunter College lecture on Women’s Liberation, of course. They discussed with you everything from the need to involve working class women in writing equal rights legislation, to the relationship between mass movements and individual creativity. But at the other lectures, too, the women were the most eager to talk about ideas for their movement. In Towson, Md., they asked about Juliet Mitchell and Sheila Rowbotham’s theories. At the URPE (Union of Radical Political Economists) conference, where you talked on state-capitalism, the questions quickly turned to the vanguard party concept and WL’s antiutopia to it.

MY QUESTION IS, why haven’t more of the women who came to our meetings shown? Are they so afraid of organizations that they cannot see the

philosophic necessity of continuing the discussions? History has surely proved that movements cannot stand still in thought: they go to a higher stage or they regress. Philosophy is not something to be enjoyed at one meeting a year, but to be lived.

I am afraid women don’t join with us because of the incredible elitism they have seen in most Left organizations. Even among women’s groups that call themselves “socialist-feminist.” Marxism of some kind is the order of the day. The women in one New York group pride themselves on not being in an organization with men, but their thinking is exactly the same as when they were in SDS in 1969. They have not reorganized themselves one bit by becoming “feminists”!

The concept of the backwash of the masses is so central to Stalin’s thought, that even if they don’t call themselves a vanguard party, they consider the masses as stupid. How can this not repel women liberationists whose movement for the past 10 years has been based on the self-development of the individual and the struggle to control her own life?

ONE PROBLEM IS the theoretic question being posed as “socialism versus feminism,” with horrible on-freedoms given as the “socialism.” Some state power or would-be power, whether it’s a party or the intellectual-writer, is presumed to embody socialism, and the only “political” discussion is which one. Would you believe, at the URPE conference session on Third World women, a woman said that North Vietnamese women have achieved equality because they do the heaviest manual labor, while Chinese women have not because the men do it and get paid more than women?

Contrast that level of discussion with the fundamental questions ruled by the new voices of Women’s Liberation: What is the unfeathered nature of women? What is human nature? What is “women’s work”? What should human labor be? What different kinds of relationships can there be between men and women, women and women, men and men?...
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and new passions" that would do it, including the 
women. We need this methodology so urgently today. 
Yet the strangest "Marxist" analyses are being put 
forth by some women. The wages-for-housework group 
and those who call office workers "the new working 
class" (replacing production workers), are going through 
contortions to fit women into some kind of static "class" 
analysis that is not Marx's at all.

He was for a social revolution by all oppressed 
groups that would completely tear up and remake the 
world. All must participate in the process if individual 
freedom is to be the end. Now, isn't that exactly what 
women liberationists are saying when they demand 
freedom now, knowing it cannot be "given" to them 
"after the revolution"? In other words, socialism and 
feminism are not opposites, but are in fact inseparable, 
it by "socialism" you mean true Marxism.

So — the problem remains, how to get the feminists 
who are now seriously searching for a philosophy of 
human liberation, to try to work out Marxism for today 
with us Marxist-Humanists? To see that it is not a 
question of fitting you as a woman philosopher, but of 
grasping philosophy? To see that it is not a question 
of party or elites, but of philosophy inseparable from 
activity and organization?

—Nelly Jackson
Instant Marxism and the Black intellectual

The Black intellectuals nowadays think that they, in turn, can rest on this abbreviated Marxism called Maoism, instead of Marxism as no substitute for "the labor, patience, seriousness and suffering of the negative"—imperative for a philosophy of liberation that brings us to become real.

TODAY'S BLACK INTELLECTUALS

The gap between Black workers and Black intellectuals in this era of sharp economic crises has become so deep that, at first sight, there seems to be no point whatever to go into the debates among self proclaimed leaders, rootless intellectuals trying overnight to "make" a revolution and a theory. Yet the deeper the economic crisis and the unbounded restlessness among workers, the more necessary it is to see what does get reflected also in the elitist movement.

(Continued on Page 7)
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The first truth is that, no matter how far removed from any direct relationship to the workers' struggles are Black intellectuals, the Black Dimension is so inherently revolutionary and, at the same time, so forced by capitalism to an intellectual ghetto, that they cannot but reflect some of the situation produced by capitalism.

Take as Establishment a person as Ralph W. Ellison, who has publicly come to tout "middle-class values." He was the very writer who produced one of the greatest novels of the 20th century written by anyone, white or Black. That work of genius, The Invisible Man, tells of so total a rejection of white society that has made the Black "invisible," that there is no way whatsoever for this truth—the art-speech of reality—to be covered up by his "sudden" discovery of middle-class values that the Blacks are now being asked to consider "protesting our anxiety over the cultural and intellectual forms of modern American society," as if that could "transcend the valueless and directionless void in which we now find ourselves." (2)

The second truth is that these intellectuals who do have some roots among workers, like Baraka and Sade, are, and who are looking for some theory, which Baraka calls an "ideology with three cutting edges": from nationalism to Pan-Africanism to socialism. We are attracted to Marxism, not because it speaks of remaining Red even if it takes "a thousand or ten thousand years" but because they think that Marxism is a short-cut to a new society. In this they reflect the proletarian impatience to do away with this exploitative, racist, imperialist, alienating society. They suffer, however, from the preoccupation of all intellectuals. They all want to be leaders and to order all others to follow. Even some like John Oliver Killens, who do recognize "the problem with instant Marxism is that Marxists is a misinterpretation of Marx," nevertheless consider the "threat" must be for leadership. (3)

Among those would-be Marxists there is one, C. L. R. James, who surely has the knowledge of class analysis, racial history and "culture." But he bows out of the whole debate by claiming that "we (James and George Padmore) never quarrelled... this quarrelling now I don't understand." Both statements are untruths, as is the one where he details the working with George Padmore between 1935 and 1939. They add up to an evasion not only of facts but of theory. (4) That can hardly help illustrate the present situation, much less allow us to hear the forces from below who are the only ones that can chew out new ground for the battle of ideas. An end must be put to all the pretentional, erasure and the myriad rewritings of history at the very moment when the passion for philosophy among the masses is so all-pervasive.

It was the Black forces from below that courageously and creatively fought the battles of the '60s and thus gave birth to a whole new generation of revolutionaries, while as well as Black. History shows that these mass forces are the only ones that can save the intellectuals from their self-consciousness and thus once and for all put an end to the old and create the new, hereby "realistic" philosophy—that is to say, make freedom a reality.

(2) "When Does a Black Join the Middle Class?" by Ralph W. Ellison, Los Angeles Times, 5-25-75.

(3) The quotations from the debate in The Black Scholar as well as others by Baraka, Sade, Killens, James are from "Black Intellectuals Divided Over Ideological Directions," by Charlotte Hunter, New York Times, 4-25-75.

(4) Consult both Pan-Africanism or Communism? by George Padmore and Black Revolutionary: George Padmore's Path From Communism to Pan-Africanism by James R. Booker for the history of the relationship of Padmore and C.L.R. James, which hardly extended to 1939 when C.L.R. James had already penned The World Revolution and become first a Trotskyist and in 1942 was co-founder with one of the state-capitalist tendency in the U.S. (See For The Record, available from News & Letters and deposited in the Baya Dougashay Collection of the Wayne State University Labor History Archives, Detroit.) It's hard to gauge from his present writings what his views have developed into since he became a professor.
Counter-revolution and revolution: what can we do?

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

(The following excerpts are from the Perspectives
Thesis delivered to the National Editorial Board meeting
of News and Letters Committees on Aug. 20. The full
report is available from N&L for 50c.)

Introduction
WHEN PHILOSOPHY AND LIBERATION
GET SEPARATED

So extreme, global, intense is every struggle in the
crisis-ridden world we inhabit that, whether it is to
an elementary question as secondary education in
Detroit, or to a complex question as the five-way bloody
struggle in Portugal, we cannot but focus on the death
and life aspects of counter-revolution and revolution.

Thus, 1) 21 years after the U.S. Supreme Court de-
clared that there is no such thing as "separate but
equal," a Detroit Federal District Judge named DeMarco
has just declared that segregated education is "quality"-
education! As if that were not regressive enough of a
step for a white District Judge to make, Detroit's Black
Mayor Young has turned so neurotically mad that he's
hardly distinguishable from that white racist.

Thus, 2) in Portugal, where the Socialist Party began
courageously even first in the revolution against
fascism, and then against Communist dominance over
the peasant world, it is now, in the North, hardly distinguish-
able from the Catholic hierarchy — and the Katanga —
with whom they are now functioning. That is not so
surprising, because Katanga collaborate with any and all
who oppose Russia, be it Social Democrats in Portugal;
capitalist class rulers in West Europe that Mao now
calls "Second World," as if that could hide their class
nature; or with Mosaddeq in Iran and Angula, U.S.
imperialism, NATO, the PLO, or the Shah of Iran. They
even trade with South Africa. In a word, there is but one
condition: being against Russia. That Russia is no doubt
doing the same thing does not make China "revolution-
ary."

There is, 3) no end to what abysmal depths hypoc-
rricy has sunk during these counter-revolutionary times,
ever-increasing levels keep appearing. The latest occurred
in Bangladesh, having murdered Sheikh Mujib and his
entire family, the murderess buried him with "full
honors." Or as the new rulers announced, the self-
declared president — Ahmed — then dubbed the counter-
revolution a revolution, first calling Bangladesh the
Islamic Republic of Bangladesh, then deeping the
theocratic designation but practicing it nevertheless.
Government by assassination has replaced politics of
debate and discussion.

Or: 4) Not many have exceeded the Shah as empire
builder . . . (but) India possesses by far the largest land,
military and air forces of any Indian Ocean littoral power.

With the total number of armed forces numbering more
than 1.3 million (including border security forces), the
Indian Army of 650,000 soldiers is said to be the fifth
largest in the world . . .

Part I

Let's see if anything, anything at all has changed this
year. The 400 million who were either starving or
severely malnourished in the poor-poor Third World
and Fourth World, and Africa, and the Middle East—are
where they were last year: starving and severely mal-
nourished.

Let's move from the poorest lands to the richest —
the USA. It is here we wish to stay, for the class enemy
is always at home. It is here where the reactionary
forces build up, but we cannot move forward unless we
know the counter-rvelutionary forces we must face.

The biggest in the world, the most militaristic, the most
nucleurally armed, the mightiest!

We're supposed to be "heading north" of the Recession.
The brainless head of the brainless Brain Trust, Arthur
Burks of the Federal Reserve Board, claims that the
recovery is so "handy hazy" that we need not worry
over much of any double-digit inflation. And, of course,
TWO WORLDS

(Continued from Page 6)

Now that we have supposedly bottomed out, these "spits" don’t even bother to claim that unemployment will be reduced more than a mere one percent from the present “average” of 8.4 percent. Even this paltry differ-
ence doesn’t end the Braintrusters’ confusion. It turns out that the Labor Dept. survey of households was supposed to show that there has been a rise from March to July of 2.2 million workers employed. However, businesses have their own (and naturally, more accurate) way of showing how many are employed—the payrolls. And they have shown that there has been no such increase.

The AFL-CIO has not only been releasing quite dif-
ferent figures of unemployment, but also of corporate growth. (NYT 8/22/75). These show: (1) that the 50
biggest banks control more than half of all bank assets
and hold controlling stakes in more than 5,000 companies. (2) That the top 119 manufacturing corporations hold more than half of all assets and get more than half of all profits in manufacturing. And (3) that the 900 biggest
U.S. corporations hold more than one-third of all busi-
ness income.

Not only that. The global reach of these companies is the major cause for the decline of the U.S. trade position and for the loss of jobs, as they are always run-
ing away to produce where labor is cheapest, be that in the South USA or South Africa, Europe or Asia.

Clearly, whether we examine the blame front or the
world situation, we have reached an abnormal point of
such crisis and retrogression that this exploitative
racist, sexist, imperialist, alienating society must be torn
up by its roots.

Part II

DIALECTICS OF ORGANIZATION: DIALECTICS OF LIBERATION

... It took Trotsky his defeat by Stalin in the late
1920s for him to recognize that Lenin alone was indis-
putable to 1917. He then took his, sten and barrel the
1929 concept of vanguardism, thereby assuring continu-
ance of the theoretic void left by Lenin’s death.

Once we picked up the line in the historic contin-
uum with the theory of state-socialism in 1943, we
were on the way both to reconsideration of the role of
labor and new beginnings, but those reassembled both
philosophically and organizationally quite blurred until
there was that new great duality in the objective reality
of 1962 with its composition to see philosophically in the
Absolute Idea itself a movement from practice, and in an
actual movement from practice a form of theory in-
self, both of which demanded organizational expression,
the Committee form of organization inseparable from
philosophy...

To meet the challenge and to meet it under the whip
cr of counter-revolution we have traced it here, whether it
be in the relations of U.S.-Russia, or China, alone, or in
Sino-Soviet conflict, Bangladesh, Islamic or otherwise,
Latin America, or Africa or India. Moreover, that whip
of counter-revolution is present not only where it is
obvious, but where it resulted in “peace”- the Middle
East shuttle...

World revolution, too, starts at home. Every word
has gotten to mean its opposite, whether we limit our-
seives to local matters like “faced housing” and “quality
education” or nothing short of “a new world economic
order”. Herein lies a new world economic order which
has meant the end of capitalism and its replacement through
the enterprise of revolution, by socialism...

Capitalism is in economic crisis for sure, and politi-
cally has been in its death throes for all too long, but it
is in the workers, the blacks, the women, and the youth—
all the creative, oppressed, revolutionary forces—who
will triumph “the terrifying structure of neo-socialism.”
And because of the totality of the crisis and the nuclear
threats that are hanging over the very survival of humanity, it becomes imperative not to rush away from the
colossal tasks just because we are so small.

Millions upon millions have the same desire as we
for a new social order and new human relations. The
vision—philosophy and revolution as a unity—can shake
up the mightiest of all capitalistic empires. The first
step in that transforming of the counter-revolution into
its opposite—actual social revolution—is being set here
in activities, mental and mental.

Yes, world revolution starts at home. Anything and
everything done here that would indeed shake the U.S.
will shake up the world, undermining the old. It may be
just one step but it can become the longest of all steps
to making freedom a reality.
Youth ID cards vs. youth passion for freedom

By Eway Dumayarkaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION and Marxism and Freedom

Recently I talked to some high school students and also sat in on an informal conference of high school youth in Detroit who came from schools ranging from the educationally "most favored," like Casa, to the "least favored," like Highland Park. They had been involved in everything from intra-school disputes with teachers to supervised types of articles the youth had dared write. They raised the whole question of de-segregated education — which was suddenly being called, not following the law of the land, 17 years too late, but "forced busing" and "reverse discrimination." Yet, while all adults in the education field of high school youth seemed to discuss nothing but busing, the youth were preoccupied with the latest and hardest manifestation of totalitarianism: ID cards.

YOUTH KNOW RACISM IN U.S.

This was not due to any delusions about how much of the very worst and worst of America is racism — from that racist occupying the White House to the lowest student in South Boston, egged on by the neo-fascist Committee of the Right. On the contrary, some had made the bus trip to South Boston to participate in the struggle against those fighting to establish white supremacy. But, as far back as 150 years ago, was the citadel of Abolitionism. Rather, it was due to the maturities of the 1970s, as against the more famous 1960s when college students thought they were being made into their own society by being computerized. Later, it was not just that they had no personal identity, but were numbers on a card. By the 1970s the high school youth were saying that, as persons, they were not just alienated, but reified, that is to say, made into things, things with pictures on them to identify living persons and tags to specify name and phone and list of courses. They felt just like prisoners, with ID cards as to fascist and totalitarian countries, who are allowed no travel abroad, no travel from country to city, or from job to job — or, like them, from school to school.

They saw little distinction between these high schools like Highland Park where the teachers cared absolutely nothing about you once they took the roll call, taught you nothing, and gave you a passing mark just so they would not have to face you twice in the same grade, and a school like Casa that was proud of its "high standards" in what they called education, but where students felt teachers often just talked "all the time." "OBJECTIVITY", ID CARDS, BRAINWASHING

One student from another school relied on an argument with no administrador because she had been courageous enough to describe a bus trip to South Boston. One would think she had just committed the most "subversive" act against the government if one were to judge by her teacher's outburst. He finally came up with the word, "subjective." The report, according to him, was not "objective."

What she wanted to know was: who was the judge of what was "subjective" and what was "objective" in a description of a demonstration — the participant in it, or the man on high sitting either in Washington, D.C., or in Detroit, Mich.? Wasn't there a division within subjective, between her story and his judgment? And wasn't there as "great a divide" between what, objectively, happened, depending on which side of the police lines you were standing? What is "observing"? What is acting?

The discussion then moved back to ID cards. At first, the reason for the introduction of ID cards was supposed to be for the protection of the students against the "criminal elements" who were preying on the students. To keep "the criminal elements" out of school, you were to have an identity card with you on entering the school. Now, you were to wear them in school and any one at all could take information from it, or membrane it, or whatever.

The point was that there is no privacy left whatever. You are not the one who decides anything; the authority decides everything. You are made to feel a prisoner because that is what you ARE. Was there any difference between this "monopoly" and the police state?

It was at this point that the whole question of brainwashing came up as it related to war situations, especially in the Korean War which by no accident, preceded the Supreme Court decision firmly to recognize that "separate but equal" has been the lie of American education since the counter-revolution of the Bourbon South against the Civil War and Black Reconstruction. It was at this point that the question moved to a philosophy of freedom, Marx's Illuminations and the adventures of Hegelian dialectics. Because it is necessary to restate it in both the old and new context, here is an excerpt from a lecture I gave several years ago.

(Continued on page 7)
TWO WORLDS

(Continued from page 5)

THE EDUCATORS MUST BE EDUCATED

That academic tradition that operates on the assumption that the generation that could understand Hegel's Phenomenology of Mind has died, cannot help to the youth of our speech grasp the grandeur of the vision of the most encyclopaedic mind of Europe who wrote:

"Within the short span of man's own life an individual must learn the whole long journey of mankind. This is possible only because the universal mind is operative in every individual mind and is the very substance of it."

It would seem that if you, we, everyone have to learn all of civilization in one's own lifetime, and that be but the preliminary for adding his/her own dimension to future mankind's history, then it would look like we all had to be geniuses. Not so, says Hegel. We have the advantage of living in an age where "what in former days occupied the energies of man of mature mental ability, sinks to the level of information. In this educational progress we can see the history of the world's civilization delineated in faint outline."

And indeed, what schoolboy doesn't know more about geography than Columbus did when he discovered America? What about the law of gravity? You can name thousands more of such examples. Good, so we start on a pretty high level — and the youth particularly, have absorbed in them 2,000 years of Western Civilization by just being born today.

It is true that Hegel himself threw a mystical veil over his philosophy by treating it as a closed ontological system, but he also warned against those who become the self-styled "representatives" of a philosophical work who, he said, "are like the dead burying the dead." He put his own faith in the public instead, not alone because of its modesty but because, "it is the nature of truth to force its way to recognition when the time comes."

That the time is NOW is heralded by the fact that we are the ones who live in what I call the age of absolutes — on the threshold of absolute freedom out of the struggle against absolute tyranny.

If the high school students have now reached such a crucial point (and I am sure we have) in their specific fights against ID cards and segregated, racist education, and for freedom not alone in education but in life, then it is we who can both best understand Marx's statement that "the educators must first be educated," and make the idea of freedom a reality. We do, indeed, live in an age which has erased the distinction between theory and practice.
TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

EDITORS NOTE: A student who has been searching for a document noted as "missing" in the Raya Dunayevskaya Collection at the Wayne State University Archives, located the article, written in 1944 on "Marxism and the Negro," and wrote: "In light of both the Black Scholar debate between Marxists and Nationalists, and the new depths of racism appearing in the ranks of white labor from Louisville to Boston, I was struck with how much this article written 20 years ago illuminates for us today. Could you reprint it in NALI?" While too long to reprint in full, brief excerpts appear below. The complete article is being added to the collection on deposit at WSU.

**MARX, LENIN, ON NATIONAL QUESTION**

Lenin's Thesis on the National and Colonial Question, which was adopted by the Second Congress of the Communist International was essentially a statement of principles. It singles out two nations as illustrative of the type of national oppression that yields mass movements of resistance. These nations are Ireland and the Negroes in America.

In his very numerous polemics Lenin emphasized that concrete historic situations, not abstract considerations, formed the focal point of theory and action on the National Question. The decisive thing was that all national oppression calls forth resistance of the broad masses of people. It is insufficient to state that revolutionaries would support these movements. It is a question of the development of the national struggles along lines of independent mass activity. As Marxists, we would, naturally, prefer—if we could indulge in such abstractions—that these movements would take a turn towards a shedding of what Trotsky calls the national shell and reveal clearly to the participants the social and class content hidden within. But history, as well as the analysis of the economic basis of what Marxists call the national question, has shown that these questions can be resolved and clarified only in the course of the struggle itself.

Marx said that as long as the bourgeoisie of one country holds domination over the other, the emancipation of the proletariat in the oppressed country is impossible. In his letter to Siegfried Kracauer and Karl Vogt, Marx amplified this idea thus:

"The ordinary English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who lowers his standard of life. In relation to the Irish worker he feels himself a member of the ruling aristocracy and capitalist against Ireland, thus strengthening their domination over himself. He cherishes religious, social and national prejudices against the Irish worker. His attitude is much the same as that of the 'poor whites' to the Negroes in the former slave states of the USA. . . . It (the antagonism) is the secret of the impotence of the English working class despite its organization."

**NATIONAL EGOSIM AND NEGRO CULTURE**

Some of the American Marxists are obsessed with the idea that, if the Negro be classed as part of the National Question, we will lose sight of the class struggle.

To say that labor is to fix it all is to say nothing. Labor has to "get all its problems. The proletariat is the only cohesive revolutionary class in present-day society and so fundamental transformation of the social order can occur except under its leadership. But meanwhile,
cultures are American—reveals both how frustrated the Negro feels at ever achieving full democratic rights in America and how desperately repressed he feels as a national minority. And, what is more important, they mean to do something about this with or without the help of revolutionaries . . .

PROLETARIANIZATION SOUTH AND NORTH

The Negro has been an integral part of labor in heavy industry since the earliest days of Southern industrialization. He was a militant number of whatever unions took root there. At the height of its power, the IWW claimed one million members, 100,000 of whom were Negroes. The most important of the IWW unions among Negroes were gathered in the prejudice-ridden South, in the lumber industries in Louisiana and Texas and among the longshoremen and dockworkers in Baltimore, Norfolk, and Philadelphia. The Brotherhood of Timber Workers in the lumber camps of Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas had 33,000 members in 1910, 80 percent of whom were Negroes . . .

The proletarian Negro is not the cowed plantation hand. He is literate and has been disciplined by the factory, knows the might of a collective group, organized by the very process of production. He is and feels himself a potent factor. He is no small minority to his white brethren in industry . . . Nevertheless, the “boss and black” relationship—that is, the racial relation having its roots in the plantation economy—still pursues him in the city as well as in the field. Segregation, Jim Crowism, social dislocations persist. The contradiction between the potency in the process of production and his seeming impotence outside cannot but find a manner of expression.

The explosive power in the struggle of the Southern Negro proletarian in the Southern metropolis will have significance in repercussions for the contiguous rural Black Belt. It will strike directly at the heart of the Southern economy and Southern politics and upset as well Northern capitalist interests which have so readily accepted the South’s segregation pattern in order to own surplus value from it. But among the millions suffering on the plantations and among the hundreds of thousands who have won themselves a place in industry, the problem before them is and must continue for a long time to be the emancipation from the national oppression which they feel at every turn . . .

URBANIZATION

In the North, too, the proletarianization and trade unionization of the Negro did not raise him to the status of the white proletariat and did not dissolve his struggle for elementary democratic rights into the general class struggle. First, in the trade unions he was still a Negro for his class as a worker. Wage differentials, seniority, upgrading have by no means been abolished. Then, outside of the trade union, he is ghettolized.

Both South and North, the Negro has become urbanized as well as proletarianized. It is the creation of a comparatively free proletariat and semi-proletariat of these large urban centers in the North which created the possibility for the development of the powerful Negro press . . .

It is precisely in the Northern urban centers that the political struggle inherent in the situation in the South receive their sharpest political expression. Capitalism, in dragging the Negroes from the South, cannot prevent the explosion and revolt of the national oppression which the semi-feudal economic relations in the South not only generate but are able to keep in subjugation. The ghettolike existence, the social humiliation not only spring historically from the cotton plantations. The cotton planation exists in the North. Its workers imbued with the ideology of the South along with the Klan, the Knights of the Camella, etc., to stimulate, encourage and organiza anti-Negro prejudices of the people of the North, fortified amongst the working class by competition in industry . . .

THAT THE PROLETARIAT will ultimately solve that problem, we have no doubt. The oppression which the bourgeoisie has so mercilessly placed upon the Negro has not only resulted in placing them in strategic industries but will give their developing class consciousness a hostility in the existing society that will determine to destroy it which must be the counterpart to the history of the Negro people in the country.

But for this very reason, the oppressed class society aided by the historic traditions of the country will see in the Negro question the focal point of attack in order to disrupt the proletariat. Under these conditions, on the one hand you have the question of seniority, closed shop, etc., and on the other hand you will again see the Negro as a nationally oppressed minority leads the union. With unemployment as the basic question facing capitalist society in the post-war period, the opportunity for creating divisions in the ranks of the proletariat will be substantially increased . . . It is equally clear that the proletariat is also aware of the dangers.

June 18, 1944
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Under the whip of the counter-revolution

Will the revolution in Portugal advance?

Thousands marched in 1975 May Day parade in Lisbon, Portugal.
TWO WORLDS
by Roya Dunayevskaya
National Chairman, News and Letters Committee

The counter-revolution that has put down the alleged “extreme Left” attempt at coup d’état in Portugal is unfolding on all fronts, from the imposition of “discipline” on factory workers in the purging of MFA (Armed Forces Movement) and re-establishing a military hierarchy loyal to “it” — the capitalist government. The militarization of radio stations except Coup’s Radio Renascence goes hand in hand with trying to drive the peasants off the occupied lands and “re-establishing” all “far left” newspapers. So much for the Socialist Party’s “struggle for democracy.” Indeed, so far to the Right has this alleged “Left Center” victory over Communism moved that Socialist States and its Major General Assures themselves that an outright fascist return. Hence, they are denouncing, not too loudly, “blind anti-Communism.”

What they mean is not the establishment of any genuine workers’ democracy or releasing of workers’ revolutionary energies, but just the inclusion in the government of the Communist Party, which is as practised as they are in class-collaborationism, and was the first to engage in strike-breaking action against the mass strikes that followed the overthrow of the fascist regime.

And the CP leader, Alvaro Cunhal, promptly acceded to them: “We have to face the new reality.”

The Nov. 30 Coup: Before and After

In a word, the Rightist move backward — the Nov. 30 coup — instead of being seen and fought as the white of the counter-revolution that it is, is being whitewashed by the press as if that was the way to avoid a bloody Chile-type coup. But the only reason they do not dare yet roll history backward so far as a mass movement in Portugal, has not been taken over by any existing parties.

Moreover, the very fact of the spontaneous mass outburst of willful strikes, which arose upon the overthrow of the fascist Censano regime and was not subordinated by any “Party,” is the reason the masses are mastering new ideological insights. Thus, the majority first mobilized for the Socialist Party because they were running away from the Communist Party in revolution against the latter’s strike-breaking activity, but now these same masses are making a second look at the class character of the SP-type of “democracy” and asking: was its espousal of democracy more than the Left covering for NATO, as if Helmut Schmidt’s West German type of “socialism” differs fundamentally from the open imperialism of Ford’s CIA? They now see it not as any kind of workers’ democracy, rather the heading for “sacrifice and hard work” is clearly a defense of the capitalistic system.

New Questions

At the same time, many questions are also being raised about the Left and its “programs” — of a concrete philosophy of liberation. Hadn’t all the “Left” acted as if General Oliveira had been the real leader of the overthrow of the Censano regime? Hadn’t there been an understanding of the need for workers’ and peasants’ struggles, student revolts, women’s movement, though there were many open instances since the mid-1970s of the renunciation in the land? Had any given full credit to the African revolutions which led the Portuguese soldiers to undermine the fascist imperialistic regime at home?

The truth is that the revolution in Portugal began in Africa, and not only because Portuguese imperialism was being, but because the African revolutions, theoretically as well as practically, were shaking up the very ones who came to shoot them down. (1)

Moreover, the national liberation struggles weren’t just the “accidental” springboards for the Portuguese revolution. Nor was it only the “civil form” of the African guerrillas which the Portuguese army copied when it began organizing its opposition. The revolutionary elements in the MFA were witnessing theoretical developments in the African revolutionary movement that moved beyond nationalism to Marxist socialism, to world relations. The “Left” leaders who rushed to Portugal, declaring most against “stalinism,” are the most demonic about their most empiricist program — if each slogan is “the” proof of socialists universality, and any deviation from any of them a capitulation to the bourgeois, a mere “Bonapartist caricature.” (2)

To Begin with the Beginning

The truth is — we must begin at the beginning — that even under D’Ajal’s “leadership” the Portuguese revolution did not begin as no more than an ordinary...

(1) See especially the African triumphs before 1970: See especially the African triumphs before 1970: the Bambeta for Mozambique, Premeir Couda, 1959; the mutiny of the military workers, and the First Revolution in Angola, 1956. The Angolan liberation movement, led by the African National Congress (ANC) and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Angola (FAPLA), played a key role in the war against Portuguese colonialism. The tireless efforts of the ANC and FAPLA, along with other liberation movements, contributed significantly to the liberation of Angola from Portuguese colonialism.

(2) These are historical facts: the suppression of the May 9th uprising of the workers of Porto Alegre, which Chamberlain adds to his list of the greatest events of the 20th century. But the May 9th uprising is remembered in the Jan. 9, 1974 issue of the Manchester Guardian.

(3) The phrase is a part of a letter to V. Couts’s Portugal a few days before the Coup. At the time, Bovard’s a special deputy in Kenya. He is on the right side of the struggle against the Portuguese colonialism and has much sympathy for the Mozambique struggle. This is where the phrase comes from.
coup d’état. Not only was Spinola not the real leader, but neither was the whole Army. Rather it was the revolutionary sections of the MFA. Thus, whereas at the start the young officers organized on an narrow and reaction-
ary level, as opposing the new conscripts becoming officers, once they organized new cells in the army, both the leadership with which the guerrillas reacted them when they were captured, and the education that was being carried on in the national liberation army began chang-
ing the nature also of the MFA within the Portuguese Army.

The lackluster of the FRELHOS in Mozambique, the PAIGC in Guinea-Bissau, and MFA in Angola may not match the frustration lies that the Bobollocks wrote in 1917, but they certainly are an entirely new ground for fighting in Portugal, 1974. In urging the
Portuguese soldiers to go home and make their own revolution, the national liberation forces were raising questions, including the role of women, that the "ad-
vanced" Portuguese had not even heard of. (2)

Because of its narrow beginnings, the radicalization of the MFA was underestimated by the Left Left, some going so far as to consider it no more than an open,
"Bonapartist caricature." Others thought that the MFA's 5th Division, which was responsible for propaganda work and called for "cultural dynamization" was but an ex-
pression of pure and simplistic Marxism. But, in fact, with all mistakes, this overraced the sheer dementias of M A I S in Portugal, headlining its paper, "Revelation in power means social-faction in power." (4)

A deeper look at new beginnings will, of necessity, lead us to the spontaneous mass movements, broad sources by revolutionary sections of the poor peasantry as well as the great proletarian strike, at which there were no less than 100,000 the first year after the overthrow of the fascist regime, the youth as well as women's Liberation Movement, which has been paid least attention, though it is a prelai form of the Third Front.

When the 30s had ended, in 1940, organized the Demo-

cratic Women's movement, it was strictly limited to economic issues..., not that "Equal Pay for Equal Work" was ever enforced even in 1974-75. Still, that movement, from above, emerged away from "feminists" issues, such as right to abortion, or other man/woman relations, though some Portuguese men
were backward enough to oppose their wives using contraceptives because it could supposedly make them impotent! Even when women were claiming they were as afraid of their men at home "as of bosses in

(2) The Struggle for Mozambique, op. cit., 142-43.
(3) Assistant Professor, who opined on the June 4, 1974 issue of Luhrs Peatler, is quoted in Boon, "Up to" (BNR, Sept. 54), if
(5) Portuguese A State of Freedom, Big Picture Publications, 1973
(6) The MFA, and movements in the north, and are both the most dynamic and comprehensive revolutionary study. It is the only one in the world to this date, and is based on the researches of the authors of the "Third Front" who have no contact with the Government, although they don't mention Communist groups or the Frontist groups, which go on anywhere just as on Portugal.

(3) "The Theory of the Portuguese Revolution," by Kenneth Marxw
ell in Foreign Affairs, Jan., 1976.

6957
instead of keeping away from ‘feminist’ questions, the Old Left better learn to recognize new forces of revolution and new ways of emergence of these forces. Before the April, 1974, overthrow of the fascist regime, end-recurrents of revolt arose among women, from literature to actual class struggles. Thus, New Portuguese Letters (published here as The Three Marias and by no means “just literature” — though great literature it is) posed questions of human relations far more profoundly than the Old Left had. Their freedom from jail was by no means due only to the overthrow of the Caetano regime, but to the protests by the international women’s liberation movement. (7) The symbol the women’s movement in Portugal especially, had chosen was Caterina Kafemni, assassinated by the National Guard during a strike for the eight-hour day.

Women became especially important in 1972 when a labor shortage sent them into textiles and electronics, and directly into the fights against multinationals: Timex,ITT, Philips, and the garment industry (where Swedish capital owned 15 of the 25 major companies). It is in textiles and electronics and shipyards where the grass roots workers’ movement first erupted, and where none questioned the militancy of women workers. But they were asking not only for a fundamental change in labor conditions, but for different relations at home.

We take agriculture. Women’s wages averaged only 58 escudos a day, 58 percent lower than men’s. Just as in Lisbon, women workers took over a family plant to make it a free service so that “working class women will be liberated from housework,” as they were among the most active in the peasant struggles of land and cultivating it on a cooperative basis. The peasants came to their tractors to take part in the Aug. 29 political demonstrations in union with the working-class tenants and squatters who were occupying houses. At Cachoeira the peasants occupied the land of the Duke of Lafões and turned that plot a cooperative. (8)
Dual Power? CRTSM? Apartheidism (Non-partyism)?

As the mass strikes showed the very first months after the overthrow of the fascist regime, there were no ordinary strikes and some cried in occupation of factories, the most important being the workers occupying the Lonavale shipyard. But while there is no doubt that one of the great developments was that at the Lonavale slaughter complex, neither it nor the Revolutionary Council of Workers, Soldiers and Sailors (CRTSM) were nationwide.

Of all the parties that arose the one that was most indigenous and revolutionary, was the PNP/RP (Revolutionary Party of the Proletariat—Revolutionary Brigades). (8) So characteristic of the revolutionary situation is anti-populism (apartheidism) that this group, a split-off from the CP, tried to assign priority, not to the party, but to the spontaneous mass organizations. They called for, and were instrumental in organizing, Revolutionary Councils of Workers, Soldiers and Sailors. The critical question became: were they really developing spontaneously and on a national scale? Was it the type of mass supporting, and an army of the working class that one could say these instances of self-activity created actual dual power?

It simply wasn’t true that there was such a self-mobilization of the masses that actually challenged the new, but very much still the capitalistic government. Nor was it true that even the most “revolutionary” sections of the NPA equalled the armed people, quintessential for a social revolution. And least of all was it true that the Constituent Assembly was anything approaching such high rhetoric. The vote was just a vote, a mere consultative one at that, that didn’t challenge continued army rule. To say, as one (8) of the Trotskyist groups maintained, that the Constituent Assembly was a “step toward a workers’ and peasants’ government,” is utter nonsense, reformist espousal.

By the time Sarens’ “social democracy” was and Gorbatchev was thrown out of government, it was the end also of the uneasy alliance of SP and PSOE, not to mention the Catholic Church hierarchy which is the true...
While Kiasinger's pronouncement, first with South Vietnam and then the Middle East and Russian detente, had, in early 1970's, not bowed to a close relationship to apartheid South Africa, by the time Angola won its freedom, U.S. imperialism was all ears in the crier call of all imperialisms and racists: South Africa apartheid, which, for more than half a century we really knew, was listened to be "Counter-revolutionary" China for whose nothing takes the place of their own nationalism which coexists not the U.S. but Russia Enemy No. 1.

Thus South Africa has won its point, West, East, and now it is not only the Ford Kiasinger-CIA-Marrs can, but the journalists, and not only such as C. L. Sulzberger, but so-called English Liberals such as the actual head of the Liberal Party, Jeremy Thorpe, and the Manchester Guardian. (11)

All are cut to shreds about what type of government is in Portugal, and how Brazil supposedly controls the MPA lease, stock and barrel, Russian detente or otherwise, the cackle is out to teach us the "principles of geopolitics"; how Portugal faces the Atlantic at the far western tip of the empire, while her islands are strategically placed on the shipping lanes between Europe, the Mediterranean and the Americas, not to mention that her "African colonies" have the best port facilities for the Indian and South Atlantic oceans.

It is not that any of this is feeling the manner; it is not even foiling the Senate. But while the Senate and House will soon capitulate, American revolutionaries must not only oppose U.S. imperialism in Portugal and Angola ("U.S. works with South Africa," p. 121), but the facts of solidarity with the Portuguese Revolution must not be separated from a serious theoretical summation of where the Portuguese Revolution was stopped, and how to try to advance under the whip of the counter-revolution.

**Dialectics of Theory**

As a first step in that direction, and in the hope that the discussion will dialectically develop, in Portugal most of all, let us begin with one of the points raised in the Draft Program of the Revolutionary Party - Revolutionary Brigade. "It is also the organization capable of making a synthesis between theory and revolutionary practice." (12)

That cannot just be stated, it must be worked out, beginning with the voices and actions that came from below, and questions asked of "what happens after" even as they raised the struggle for workers control of production, CNT-FAI, and the ways of self-defense to fight the myriad forms of counter-revolution is imposed on Portuguese and as part of world capitalism, as it contrives to get back total power.

From the very first proletariat revolution, 1848, Marx had drawn the conclusion "From the first moment of victory, and after it, the distrust of the workers must not be directed anymore against the convened reactionary party, but against the previous ally, the petty bourgeois democratic, who desire to exploit the common victory only for themselves." (13)

Instead of quelling ordinarily what Lenin paid on the Party in 1912 - a position he many times revised (14) - why not see how Lenin recognized his thought when he was first confronted with the betrayal of the German Social Democracy and raised the perspective: Transform the Imperialist War into Civil War, not just as a slogan, but the new philosphy, dialectical question of transformation into opposite. (15) By 1913, "All power to the Soviets" was tested in the philosphy, conceptual and its political expression in State and Revolution; that there can be no new society unless producive and the state is run by the population "to a man, woman and child." (16)

To reduce that to a question of the Party, the Party "be led," as everyone from the Communists, Maoists, Trotskyideats (of all varieties) are doing, is to destroy the resurgence of the revolution. Stop to think as well as to do. (We will return to the subject in a future issue, after we have heard from Portugal.)

---


(12) The South Africa Revolutionary United Front Manifesto was included in a special page in People's Democratic Service on Political and Social Science.

(13) Karl Marx's 1850 Address.


(15) Along with Lenin's works, see his Critical and Numerous Principles on the Tablet in an Appendix to that work (Cambridge, Mass.

(16)
Middle East, UN, OAU—and ideological obfuscation

By Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION and Marxism and Freedom

Editor's Note: We print below excerpts from the first of a new series of Political-Philosophical Letters by Raya Dunayevskaya (see 60, p. 7). The historic analysis of the Middle East, the UN, and the OAU may appear "dated" now that the OAU has voted to recognize the MPLA as the legitimate government of Angola. In fact, however, it is more relevant than when written because, in the dialectics of liberation, time is decisive. There is a world of difference between being when the battle field victories are beyond dispute, and being when everything is at war's end.

January 24, 1976

Dear Friends,

Three fantastic occurrences in three widely separated parts of the world this month raise such abysmal lower depths of ideological confusion that they could lay ground only for counter-revolutionary, not for revolutionary, developments. It is imperative, therefore, to look at these events, not merely as passing "immediates," but in an historic-philosophic context.

First, let's look at what followed the passing of the UN Resolution which equated Zionism with racism: 1) the break-up of the OAU meeting in Ethiopia over the question of recognizing the legitimacy of the MPLA government in Angola; and 2) the war in Lebanon which is calling into question the philosophic underpinnings not only of that UN Resolution, but of that whole "bourgeois" kitchen." This expression of Lenin's for the League of Nations that followed World War I, just as succinctly characterizes the UN that followed World War II and also called itself a "peace" establishment... .

In the Arab Middle East, the unifying force—anti-Israel—cuts across the myriad contradictions. Thus, as if Lebanon wasn't distinguishable in a fratricidal war between Christian and Muslim, Arab/Islam feels no compunction about shooting over machine-guns fire, the thousands of dead bodies, and the rubble, that this all is an Israeli "conspiracy," a war initiated by "international Zionism... ."

Lebanon, an artificial state which does have Christians and Muslims, can't escape the class division, and is at this very moment steeped in civil war. These Lebanon Modern Left, who are fighting a genuine revolutionary class struggle against its rulers, Christians mainly but Muslims, too, are being kept in check. The overriding order is never to forget that Israel is the enemy. Lebanon, 1975-76, is in danger of replaying the slaughter in Jordan, 1954-55. Will Syria enter, or will the PLO under its control? The PLO always its adherents anything except a revolutionary class struggle within "the Arab nation... ."

RATHER THAN CONCERNING ourselves with the UN vote on the Resolution equating Zionism with racism—72 for, 35 against, 32 abstaining—we can get more illumination on whether that Resolution is but the latest form of anti-Semitism or a genuine struggle against racism by turning to the second event that followed the vote—the break-up of the OAU meeting in Ethiopia, January 8. Herefore, the one thing that always united all independent African nations and those fighting for independence was the total, unequivocal opposition to apartheid South Africa. No matter how wide the divisions between the African countries, and no matter how deep the divisions within any one country, including even the outright civil war in Nigeria, no African entertained the slightest doubt that, as a continent, Africa will never be fully independent so long as racist South Africa exists...

Suddenly, the world was confronted with this spectacle at the OAU meeting in January, 1976: 1) The U.S.-Zaire-South African-supported FNLA and UNITA leaders were seated on the platform. 2) No one word was spoken against the Africans' new rich "friend" Saudi Arabia, that was funneling money to these puppets. 3) The 20 African nations who had already recognized the MPLA as the legitimate government of Angola could muster only two others to be with them. 4) The OAU adjourned with no decision being taken.

The tragedy isn't so much whether or not a decision on Angola was arrived at but why the shadow of South Africa hanging over the contending forces didn't act as the unifying force it had always been. Clearly, the global struggle for world domination had entered that cooal as it had in Portugal... .

IT IS IMPOSSIBLE to see what one does not want to see. The obiditch kingdoms can hardly be considered an integral part of the poor Third World, the world that

(Continued on Page 7)
Everything totally changed with the Great Depression, and the rise of Nazism, accompanied by such manifestations of anti-Semitism, the “degeneration of workers’ state” that Trotsky changed his position on the Jewish Question. The density of today’s Trotskyites is not grasping either theoretically or practically what happened shows itself clearest in their position today which have nothing whatever to do with Trotsky’s principled statement, he that on the question of permanent revolution in the Jewish question. Not having the slightest conception of what is the dialectical relationship of the objective to the subjective situation—what is the dialectics of liberation when more than one national movement exists, they simply hide both the root of the change and the why Trotsky, as the great revolutionary he was, changed his position...

**WORLD WARS** had totally changed the objective situation. The creation of the state of Israel changed it still further for the Middle East. Two realignments thereupon took place: one, the existence of Israel, and with that success, the creation of another national consciousness—the Palestinian people. Their right to self-determination can no more be decided from above, he is no more a Jewish kingdom and emirates, or the PLO claiming state sovereignty, much less through a UN command. The Palestinian people speak for themselves. Naturally, Zionism is power, the ideology of all ruling classes, be they Jewish or Moslem, Christian—or the big power they themselves, West and East, in exploitative. Which is why, precisely why, the main enemy is always in one’s own country. The Israeli masses will fight that battle. Far from encouraging such action, the UN Resolution equating Zionism with racism, while the PLO representative affirms: Zionism differs “in no way from apartheid in South Africa” cannot but remind one of the Big Lie... 

For the Left to come to a stance, now, to aid in such ideological obscurity cannot but smooth the way for the counter-revolution. A necessary first step to turn matters around is to clear up our heads so that the history of revolutions, the dialectics of liberation becomes the path for their actualization.

Yers, Baya
The Black dimension in Women's Liberation

April, 1976

Two Worlds

by Raya Dunavskaya
Author of Philosophy and Revolution
and Marxism and Freedom

(Editor's Note: The following excerpts are from speeches given in front of audiences ranging from Venice W.A.G.O. in San Francisco, to the University of California, for Adult Education of W.U./U.M. Detroit, Hunter College in New York, De Paul University in Chicago, C.I. State in L.A., and George Washington in Washington, D.C. They show the directions that have been taken up in our new pamphlet on Working Women, which is going to be compiled and published in our special 2-page May issue of HAL.)

We may think we know at least two names from the past—Sojourner Truth and Harriet Tubman. But do we really know them not as black liberationists, but as leaders, as inspirers of the first women's rights convention of white middle-class women and ready to break with their Black male leaders, even those as great as Frederick Douglass? When it comes to the struggle for the women's liberation after the Civil War? To grasp the Black dimension in this to learn a new language, the language of thought, Black thought. For many, this new language will be difficult because they are hard of hearing. Hard of hearing because they are not used to this type of thought, a language which is both a struggle for freedom and the thought of freedom. Take the question of the language of activity in the Underground Railroad where Harriet Tubman was one of the greatest conductors. She didn't just escape from the South. She returned 19 times, and she brought out 300 people—and there is more. In a few years, she will find her name and we will acknowledge that she was a conductor and a great one. But do they speak of all the creativity that goes into being a conductor of the Underground Railroad that you become a guerrilla fighter as well? Do they speak of what a leader of men and women? Just look what it means to know your country, the country that you only being out Black, but the leader of a battalion of whites.

Or take the language, the creativity, the idea of freedom involved in the very name of Sojourner Truth. "Are ye a white woman? Yes. How do you prove your greatness?" and was by no means the only outspoken and creative talk. Think of the originality in the way she presented the white crierwomen heckling her and not allowing her to have her say. She turned things with the question of whether they believed in Jesus. Consider the self-righteousness with which they replied, and her come-back reply: "Jesus is the son of God and Mary, and man had not a thing to do with it."

When we move to the period after the Civil War when slavery was abolished we see that even such greats as Frederick Douglass—who had been with the women in their battles before this struggle for the 14th Amendment—that they were silent. The 14th Amendment was the amendment for the inclusion of the vote for the women; and we find that Sojourner Truth and Harriet Tubman separate from Frederick Douglass. They insist on continuing the struggle for women's liberation. Listen to the poetry of Sojourner Truth's prose: "I am coming from the land of slavery. This is a land for the poor. It is not open to the Black people, appealing for continuation of the struggle for women's vote: "I hate to see my Black man being as bad as the white man." Then turning to the greatest of them, who are stepping aside, she says that it is "short-minded" to stop the struggle at getting the vote only for Black men.

In the concentration on the struggle of freedom, the Black dimension in women's liberation extend of the whole philosophy of human liberation. Now if we jump to the early 20th century, we find the same thing. A much under-rated woman in that sphere is Amy Jacques Garvey. She isn't just the wife of Marcus Garvey. She had edited the women's page in Negro World, and edited Garvey's words often does bring along to them a great name—"Philosophy and Opinion of Marcus Garvey".

Here she is, speaking in 1925: "A race cannot be saved, a country must be redeemed. And unless we understand the leadership of the African Negro man, we will now be saved. In the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women," brush aside thectl towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women," brush aside the fighting towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women." brush aside the fighting towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women." brush aside the fighting towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women." brush aside the fighting towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women." brush aside the fighting towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women." brush aside the fighting towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women." brush aside the fighting towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women." brush aside the fighting towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women." brush aside the fighting towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women." brush aside the fighting towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women." brush aside the fighting towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women." brush aside the fighting towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women." brush aside the fighting towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women." brush aside the fighting towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women." brush aside the fighting towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women." brush aside the fighting towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women." brush aside the fighting towarding Negro men, and she's ready to fight all the way. We are becoming so impatient that we are getting into the front ranks and serve notice on the world that we are talking about Black women."

Or take the African continent again, it was not the educated man, but illiterate women who added a new page of history. When in 1939, the British imperialists in Eastern Nigeria decided to tax the women, they got so furious they went on a spontaneous strike—which was, of course, called a riot. The great riots. It was not only spontaneous, it was against all the orders of everyone, including the educated males. It was not only against British imperialism, but against their own African chief, who had not defended them. Above all, they crushed all killed lines. And they won, though not until 40 women were killed and countless others injured.

What happened right here in the U.S. in 1967 is the same. It is the wonderful North Carolina youth who sat at a restaurant lunch counter and started the magnificent Black Revolution. But the fact is that, five years earlier, one solitary woman, Rosa Parks, a seamstress, refused to give up her seat on the bus, and was arrested, and the incident spread to the youth that the entire Black people behaved in a different manner than they had ever dreamed of. They decided they would all get out of the courthouse; they organized their own transportation and boycotted all the buses; they inspired Rev. King to be with them, and they kept all decisions in their own hands by meeting three times a week. The new stage of Black revolt began there.

Right up to our own period we find there is a double rhythm in revolution. The overgrowth, what is called the first negation, is saying No to what is. But the second negation, the creation of the new is harder, because you want to have entirely new human relations. In addition to all the great Black women, we have mentioned, there is another in the new movement, Bettye Wright, who related exactly this question when she said, "I am not thoroughly convinced that the black liberation: the way it's being spelled out, will really and truly mean my liberation. I'm not sure that when it comes time to put down my gun, that I won't have a brown shoe in my hand, as so many of my Cuban sisters have." She was not putting the question down as a condition. "I won't make a revolution out of having Negro She was posing the question of what happens after. That is what we have to answer before, in the practice of our own organizations, our own thought and our own activity.
Chicano culture, Marxism and revolution

California, all the radicals of the time, especially Lusinchi, suddenly began saying: "Workers are all backward and need to be educated," but then we were sent to Parliament, and we will get them their freedom.

Marx answered them in his Address to the Communist Leagues. He said that we, the revolutionary intellectuals, more than the workers, have to learn that those who believed that capitalism still had a revolutionary character and that there was a way through parliament, were wrong. The revolution must go on in permanence—not only will we go to the proletarian revolution, but we will also realize that every revolution has a dual rhythm. That the first occasion, the destruction of the old, is just that; it is not yet the creation of the new.

NOW SKIP OVER ONE hundred years and we come to 1950. The few revolutionary intellectuals who at least saw that there was a two-way fight between Russia and the United States for control of the world, could not see what Marx originally meant by Humanism and what it meant for us then—whether in the alinement of labor and the fight against Automation in the 1800 general strike of miners in West Virginia and Pennsylvania, or in the redefinition of the youth who were said to be only "bait." Three years later—after the first mass uprising against Russian totalitarianism, the East German workers' revolt—Marx's 1844 essays were suddenly brought out of the archives and onto the historic stage.

And once again the revolution, the humanism, the culture, the philosophy were put together. There was no one, whether in Africa fighting against all the European imperialism, or in China against Chiang Kai-shek, or in Cuba against both Batista and U.S. imperialism, who failed to question that only a national revolution, or will we now have new human relations?

EVERYONE KNOWS WHAT Castro is now, but he wasn't a Communist in 1950. The revolution was a bourgeois Cuban revolution—why he led without any help from Russian communism. In order to emphasize that he was starting something new to the world, he said in his first speech in 1959: "Standing between the two political and economic ideologies or positions being debated in the world, we are holding our own position. We have named it humanism... This, our Cuban revolution, is a humanistic revolution because it does not degrade man of his essence but holds him as its basic aim. Capitalism sacrifices man. The communist state by its totalitarian concept sacrifices the rights of man..."

Now in the '50s you had all kinds of tendencies, and for Cuba the question was where do we go from here with American imperialism 10 miles away? Do we have a way, with the rest of Latin America, Africa or Asia to appeal to the masses in other countries or do we have to choose a state power? Of course we know what Castro chose eventually. The point for us to work out is that in each case it isn't that there is a different culture; it isn't that it's a different period, it is a historic period; it is whether you want to actually have these new, totally human relations. The question to answer is: who are the forces of revolution and how do you not divide reason from revolution?

WHAT DID Marx do in relation to culture—where he takes up the role of commodities in the very first chapter of Capital? What did Marx reveal that was so great and that Lusinchi didn't understand but who you lived the '60s and the youth and the proletarian East? The proletariat and the alienated labor that they feel—
the fact that they have been made into an appendage of a machine—gives us the greatest force that will overthrow this society. But that isn’t the only alienation.

Why couldn’t classical political economy, which discovered labor as the source of all value, see the subject of that source? It should have come naturally to that conclusion. It didn’t because you, yourself, are a prisoner of the historical moment in which you live. Marx said: All of this time we were asking ourselves why the product of labor always assumes the form of a commodity and its exchange. But the human beings who have created all these things, why are they “things”? The intellectuals, who make so much of “culture,” don’t recognize the reification of their own thought.

Even when they oppose the ruling thought, they are still reified because whatever they cannot merely oppose. Something new has to be created and you can’t do that unless you know what comes from below.

THROUGHOUT THE ’60s, all the freedom movements that had begun, whether here or abroad, theory was looked down upon; the thinking was that it could be picked up “on route.” But 1988 didn’t make the revolution; it turned out to be a near or an aborted revolution in Paris. In 1974 we had the greatest mass demonstrations, whether in Washington, D.C., or right here in Los Angeles—when 25,000 Mexican-Americans came out. And they shut you down. Including Ruben Salazar, because if you’re Chicago, you’re not supposed to think at all. But what remained after all the demonstrations—even though we were able to stop the Vietnam War, was Nixon—and now Ford.

What does it mean for us today—when we see what comes after an aborted revolution? We have to return to what Marx did under the whip of the counter-revolution; we have to work out the equivalent of the Permanent Revolution for our day.

I would like to conclude with a quote from my special introduction to the Mexican edition of Marxism and Freedom, which will be published this year.

“The United States revolutionary intellectual cannot but be distressed at seeing the other America than that of U.S. capitalism which has so unmitigatedly an imperial record in Latin America, whether that be the American-Mexican War of 1846-48 which took away so much of Mexico’s land, or the occupation of the Panama Canal Zone which U.S. imperialism to this day daren’t rule in perpetuity, or the neo-fascist coup in Chile which the Nixon Administration, ever since 1970, did so much to finance, arm and inspire...

Each generation meets the challenge of the times or falls into oblivion. No one can be under the illusion that our epoch marks the type of turning point in history where history falls in turn. On the contrary. Precisely because of the political-philosophic maturity of our age, the moment these past two decades from practice that is itself a form of theory, we can meet this challenge, provided we return to the Humanism of Marxism and the new dialectics of liberation Lenin worked out on the eve of 1917; on the level of the new in our epoch.”
by Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION and Marxism and Freedom

(Editor's Note: We print below brief excerpts from Raya Dunayevskaya's lectures on "Women as Thinkers and as Revolutionaries", which appear as a special appendix in her newest pamphlet, WORKING WOMEN FOR FREEDOM. See also, p. 6.)

I. MASS CREATIVITY AND THE BLACK DIMENSION

What today we call Women's Liberation as an idea whose time has come, are movements from practice, from below, that have been accumulating through the ages.

Take the so-called Alia "folds" in Eastern Nigeria.

In 1929, some 30 years before anyone thought seriously of Africa, much less African women, as a new development of world freedom. It was in this auspicious year that the market women in Eastern Nigeria were suddenly taxed by the occupying British Empire. The self-organization of the women established a totally new form of struggle which transcended all tribal divisions: the Yoruba, Hausa, as well as the smaller tribes. United, powerful, and violent was the opposition of the women to the alia, to their own chiefs, as well as to the British imperial rule, that it became impossible to contain the revolt.

Has any historian, or even revolutionary, seen that historic as a ground from which a great leap into freedom as well as leadership was achieved in the 1920s? Nor can the neglect be explained only by the fact that the event occurred in the Africa, back at the outbreak of the Great Depression.

Take the Women's Rights Convention in this country in 1848, at Seneca Falls, N. Y., a fact often enough recorded by women historians today. All underestimate the Black dimension which inspired the white, middle-class educated women to strike out on their own.

Have we asked ourselves, as we proudly repeat Women's

Women as thinkers and as revolutionaries

by Raya Dunayevskaya

Liberation is an idea whose time has come, such simple questions as: 1) How does it happen that our very names, "bred from patriarchy," do not measure up to Sojourner Truth's, whose whole philosophy of liberation is included in her name? 2) Have we ever today, as we inveigh against "male domination," compared it to Sojourner Truth's separation from Frederick Douglass after the Civil War for being "short-minded", because she did not wish to burden the struggle for passage of the 15th Amendment by demanding also the right of women to vote? And 3) have today's women theorists built on that movement from below, not only as force, but as reason? Nor have any analyzed it within the context of that year of revolutions, 1848.

Other than Marx's genius, what was in the air that led to Marx's discovery of a whole new continent of thought? Can we today afford to let the ruling ideology keep us hemmed into American pragmatism? Shouldn't we, as women, at least be aware of the fact that the year Marx first broke with bourgeois society and worked out a philosophy of liberation which he called "a new Humanism" — 1843 — was also the year when a woman, Fanny Tristan, proclaims the need for an international of men and women that would put an end to the division of mental and manual labor.

II. RUSSIA, FEBRUARY 1917: GERMANY, JANUARY 1918; AND ROSA LUXEMBURG

Now let's turn to the 20th century and see, firstly, what we can learn from women as masses in motion, initiating nothing short of the overthrow of that reactionary humanism — the dramatic, creative, empire-shaking five days in February, 1917; and, second, let's turn to the 1918 German Revolution, and its greatest theoretician, Rosa Luxemburg.

From 1839 when she fought the first appearance of reformism in the Marxist movement; through the 1905 Revolution in which she was both a participant and out of which she drew her famous theory of the Mass Strike; from 1916-17 when she broke with Karl Kautsky — four years in advance of Lenin's designation of Kautsky as not only opportunist but betrayer of the proletariat — and when she first developed her anti-imperialist struggle and her writings, not only as political militancy but carving out her greatest and most original theoretical work, Accumulation of Capital; to the 1918 Revolution, she made no division between her theory and her practice...
TWO WORLDS

(Continued from Page 5)

Luxemburg was not only involved in lecturing and developing an anti-imperialist struggle over the Morocco crisis which would, in turn, lead to her greatest theoretical work, Accumulation of Capital, but she also turned to work on the woman question, which heretofore she had left entirely to Clara Zetkin, who was editing the greatest German women’s magazine, Die Heilige, from 1891 to 1917.

The magazine’s circulation rose from 5,500 in 1903 to 112,000 in 1913. Indeed, by the outbreak of the war, the female membership in the German Social Democracy was no less than 170,000. It is clear that, as great a theorist as Rosa Luxemburg was, and as great an organizer as Clara Zetkin was, they were not exceptions to the ignored status of German women. On the contrary, it would be more correct to say that there wouldn’t have been as massive and important a revolution in Germany were there not that many women involved in the revolution...

Has the Women’s Liberation Movement nothing to learn from Rosa Luxemburg just because she hasn’t written “directly” on the “Woman Question”? Outside the fact that the letter doesn’t happen to be true, should not the corpus of her works become the real text of woman as revolutionary and as thinker and as someone who has a great deal to tell us as women’s liberationists of today?

III. AN ONGOING REVOLUTION AND TODAY’S WOMEN THEORISTS

We need to examine, if only briefly, today’s on-going Portuguese Revolution to see the historic continuity of working class women; he motion as shapers of history. As far back as two decades ago, when the totally new movement from below began with the outbreak of the East European revolt against Russian totalitarianism, signaling a new world stage of the struggle for freedom from under totalitarianism, and no one was paying attention to the fascist regime in Portugal, there were struggles of workers, of women, of peasants...

Women became especially important in 1973 when a labor shortage sent them into textiles and electronics, and directly into the fight against multinationals. It is in textiles and electronics and shipyards, where the grass roots workers’ movement first erupted, and where none questioned the militancy of women workers. But they were asking not only for a fundamental change in labor conditions, but for different relations at home, as well as raising totally new questions of revolution and new human relations...

Working class women have a very special reason for their passionate interest in revolution. Not simply because they’re exciting events, but because they show working class women in motion as shapers of history. The dialectical relationship of spontaneity to organization is of the essence to all of us as we face today’s crisis. It is not only Portugal which is under the weight of counter-revolution that began Nov. 52, 1973. The global struggle for power between capitalist imperialism and state-capitalist societies calling themselves Communists, all newly armed, has put a question mark over the very survival of humanity.

Creativity that can really tear things up at their roots and genuinely start something new, humanly new, can only come from mass creativity. It is only then when it is totally revolutionary, is not hampered in by the concept and practice of the “Party to lead,” and it is only then that it can once and for all end shorted and unfinished revolutions.

6967
This special introduction gives me great pleasure to write not just because of memories of Mexico, 1937-40, when I was there as Secretary to Leon Trotsky, but because of what that exciting historic period does to illuminate the world today. Indeed, President Cardona had not only granted asylum to Leon Trotsky but when he was being reared by Stalin in the great Forman trials in history, but was, at the same time, challenging U.S. imperialism by being the first to do away with American domination over Mexican oil. Above all in these years toward the Spanish Revolution, going still further back in history, Tranta Fanon, in 1001, pointed to the Spanish, in their fight against Napoleon, rediscovering what the American revolutionaries used in their struggle for freedom from Great Britain. They named the partisans guerrillas. The point was that the strategy, and the logistics of the American liberators were inseparable from an understanding philosophy of liberation which Fanon felt indispensable for the African revolutions reshaping the world.

**THE UNITED STATES revolutionary intellectual cannot but be distressed by seeing the other America, that of U.S. capitalism which has so unilaterally an imperial record in Latin America—whether that be the American—Mexican War of 1846-48 which took pay so much of Mexico's land; or the occupation of the Panama Canal Zone which U.S. imperialism to this day denies right to its perpetuity; or the neo-fascist coup in Chile which the Nixon Administration, ever since 1970, did so much to finance, arm and inspire. The fact that the Interim Report of the U.S. Senate Intelligence Commission has finally revealed the harrowing details of these days and now comes out strongly against assassination does not keep it from showing its own capitalist class nature by being thoroughly ambivalent on attempts to organize coups against a whole people. The American people can feel nothing but shame against Ambassador Kerry writing to the retiring President Ford against President-elect Allende: "Not a nut or bolt will be allowed to reach Chile under Allende... We shall do all within our power to conform Chile and the Chileans to utmost privatization and poverty..."

The American people cannot but separate themselves from such dishonored imperialism, and are, at this very moment, pressuring the ruling class against its continuation. Thereby they display greater solidarity with the Latin American people than with their own government. The solidarity which is most meaningful is expressed by revolutionary intellectuals for whom acts of solidarity are inseparable from a philosophy of liberation.

**MEXICO ALSO HAS memories for me after I broke with Leon Trotsky at the time of the Hitler-Stalin Pact when I could no longer follow him in his espousal of the defense of Russia as a worker's state "though degenerate". I returned to the U.S. to begin the research and development of my library of Russia, as a state-capitalist society and in 1944 had the opportunity in translation and expose (in the American Economic Review) Stalin's revision of Marx's law of value. At the end of World War II, I returned to Mexico to meet with Natalia Sedova Trotsky, in whom I read the first draft of what, in a decade, finally became Marxism and Freedom, of which this is the eight edition.

When the first edition was completed in 1957, this work ended with the new pages of freedom signaled by the East European Revolutions against Russian totalitarianism, and the Black Revolution in the U.S. initiated by the Montgomery Bus Boycott. When, in the early 1960s, the Sino-Soviet conflict erupted in the open, I wrote a new Chapter (XVII), "The Challenge of Mao Tse-tung." The split of Marxist terminology can no longer, I maintained, cover up the nationalistic politics in the Sino-Soviet conflict and we must, instead, ask: Can there be war between two countries calling themselves Communist? What sounded "wild" in 1950 has very nearly become a cliche ever since Mao rolled out the red carpet for Nixon, as Teng is doing for Ford.

(Continued on page 8)
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today, 1974-75, while lecturing him against "detente" with Russia. It would, indeed, be a sad commentary on our era if genuine revolutionaries still persisted in attaching themselves to one or another of the poles of the international cold war, as close friends and colleagues in class nature from U.S. imperialism, instead of striking out on a truly independent road of social revolution.

Revolution does not arise in the fullness of time for the purpose of establishing The Chairman or a party machine. The Leader Maximus and the party (party monoliths) are there to throb the revolution, not to release the creative currents which are the energies of the millions. Marxism is either a theory of liberation or it is nothing. In theory and in life, it lays the basic for achieving a new human dimension, without which no new society has viability.

WE LIVE IN a "birth-time of history and a period of transition" such as characterized the age in which Marx lived. Only now is the world wide urge, and begins with the question: What happens after the revolution that has so often led to a transformation into opposite? A task confronts our age: How can the movement from theory meet the challenge of the movement from practice which seeks a totally new relationship of theory to practice so that it can reconstruct society on new, truly human bases? Just as Marx had the task of the "radical Commune" of his day who thought all evils of capitalism would be overcome with the abolition of private property, we must not fall into the trap of mistaking Commune's "anti-capitalism", i.e., planned economy, for any other than what it is—the full logical development of capitalism itself into state-capitalism.

The unity of theory and practice that characterized Marx's new continent of thought remains the vision that can move the genuine revolutionaries still transformed into utopian such as that which characterized the transition of the Third World from a war-ravaged state into a newer, a more socialist type of economic system, and which presently threatens the Third World. We who were witnesses to the terrible crisis of 1962 and saw Cuba emerge in the wake of the two super-powers in search of a new global balance, have seen the new urgency of the merging passion for philosophy from a new generation of revolutionaries within each land, the U.S. included. Whatever the reason, the capitalist UN shoves Mexico as the place to celebrate International Women's Year in 1975. It is part of this very fact that besides the fact remains that it is symbolic of both the Third World and the new alliances.

THROUGH ALL the eight editions of Marxism and Freedom there has been no change in either the context or the function of the book, which is based on the movement from practice to theory and a new society through a 20-year period of revolutionary historical development—the age of revolution. It would seem that its time has come. The 1974's edition has gained a new urgency in the cause of the merging passion for philosophy from a new generation of revolutionaries within each land, the U.S. included. Whatever the reason, the capitalist UN shoves Mexico as the place to celebrate International Women's Year in 1975. It is part of this very fact that besides the new alliances.

The passion for philosophy that has emerged in this decade, as against the 1960's when activism in general and guerrilla war in particular reigned theory to an inconsequential thing that could be picked up "en route", has often been in a tug of war in recent months. Wherein 1967 Debray rejected theory as if it were no more than "the vice of excessive idealism" in favor of "military focus" that would decide all, and at the Leader Maximus would be all, he has just now published a critique of his previous concepts which led to such disasters. Unfortunately, in prentomly brainstorming to Lenin's Philosopher Notebooks for a dialectic of negativity Debray is attempting quite a feat: "deducing" from a unity of opposites still another form of "military focus". No wonder he once again ends up on a merry-go-round of tactics elaborated to strategy.

Debray has learned even less from Lenin than from Salvador Alende who, in analyzing for him the struggle of the Latin American people against U.S. imperialism, said, "The living death of the people cannot continue," concluding that "the liberation of Chilean energies" would "rebuild the nation." Fortunately, Debray's poverty of philosophy has no power to invalidate Lenin's concept of the dialectics of liberation, much less to substitute a petty-bourgeois subjectivism for the dialectic situation of our day that gave birth to a veritable passion of philosophy on the part of the masses. It is they who refuse any longer to separate, the actual liberation struggles from the philosophy of liberation which would lay themselves upon for still another unfinished revolution.


JUST AS, at the outbreak of World War II, the Second International betrayed of the proletariat and victory of Marxism led Lenin to return to the philosophic origins of Marx in the Hegelian dialectic as his theoretical preparation for revolution, so the aborted revolution and the disastrous playing with guerrillas warfare in our era must lead us to a total re-examination of the relationship of theory to practice. Lenin's return to dialectics laid the foundation for the Great Divide in Marxism (see Chapter 2). It is there we must begin.

Each generation meets the challenge of the times or fails into confusion. No one can be under the illusion that our epoch marks the type of turning point in history where history falls to turn. On the contrary, precisely because of the political-philosophic maturity of our age, the movement these past two decades from practice that is itself a form of theory, we can meet this challenge, provided we return to the Humanism of Marxism and the new dialectics of liberation Lenin worked out on the eve of 1917, on the level of the new in our epoch. In our age of absolutes, when revolution and counter-revolution are so interlocked, it is not only the intellectuals "in general" who must change their ivory towers: so, too, must the Marxist theoreticians. Marxism and Freedom is a contribution toward that end.

Raya Dunayevskaya
Detroit, Michigan
December, 1975
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Death of Mao Tse-tung: the Thought of Mao

which hit Kirin Province in March, suddenly brought out that when an earthquake had occurred in 260 B.C., "some people made use of a meteorite to start the reactionary rumor that the land will be divided after the death of the First Emperor.""

By July, when the most devastating earthquake hit China, and the three major industrial casualties of the Tangshan earthquake were coal, steel and electricity, plus great damage in China's third largest city, Tsingtao, the editorials turned to stories of looting.

No figures were ever given as to how many people died, but it is thought that there are as many as 100,000 dead. Such a natural disaster, for which the Central Committee is certainly not responsible, nevertheless produced a series of slogans like: "Do not become entangled in old grievances among revolutionary masses," "Do not become involved in scattered fighting teams, and still less in struggle by force," "Increase production!"

THE STRUGGLE FOR MAO'S MANTLE

There has been quite a bit of unrest in the country, especially among the most militant of the workers. This intensified the struggle for power at the top, and Mao was even called to the People's Congress in the Army, in the Army, in the People's Congress, and to address "the people of all nationalities." But in fact, this was indeed the year of "troubles under Heaven."

It began with Chou En-lai's death, was immediately followed by the campaign against Teng, who had delivered the oration and was evidently Chou's man. The Chinese people had evidently considered it a campaign against Chou himself, as was clear by the tremendous demonstrations in April over the question of wreaths being removed from his grave. This April revolt was preceded by an editorial in March in the People's Daily which, in commenting on the first meteorite shower

(Continued on Page 8)
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1st lines pursed by Chen Tu-hsiu, Chú Chi-pai, Li Li-saa, Lo Chang-chun, Wang Jihang, Chang Kao-hsiu, Kuo Kang, Jao Shu-hsii and Peng Teh-huai and again, during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, triumphed over the counterrevolutionary revisionists line of Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping." (11)

Not a single capital is on that list, and hardly a single one from the Long March has been left alive. These are the names of the General Staff of the Chinese Revolution who had disagreed with Mao in the 1920's or since power was gained in 1949 up to this very day, when Hu was still calling for an intensification of the campaign against Teng.

Not to be disregarded is the fact that ex-Defense Secretary Schleuring was in China, by special invitation from Mao himself, was the first Westerner to visit Chinese nuclear installations, and is more than just a symbol of the view that "Russia is Enemy No. 1."

What, then, is the legacy of Mao? It is only that Mao has been expert in carrying the "civil war" into the Party itself, into the Army, into the People's Congress, and now that none have his authority, they will still continue. Every revolution seems to devour its own children; the Chinese, Mao made sure, in devouring his children, left one and only one, unaltered.

What does the peculiar failure now in power mean by the numerous "Long Live invincible Marxian-Leninian-Maoist Thought" (2)? Is it the new series of "anti-revolution" (2), or is it the material truth that philosopher Mao called China to a level of superpower, A-bomb Included?

None can say, for the shoes, now already they have laid the hails, a battle of Western press (3) has rumbled loud, fine and sinister, for while-washing the truth of Mao's destruction of all his "closest comrades-in-arms" by saying that Mao's legacy could not be given to any single leader; "all 850 million Chinese are philosophers."

WHAT IS MAO'S LEGACY?

As are known ever since the days of Stalin, when he unleashed the attack on Trotsky as "capitol" who wanted the mantle of Lenin for himself, while he, humble Stalin, saw the possibility of Lenin's work in a "collective leadership," each collectivity has ever been the path to the single Man Rule.

The fact that none can fill Mao's shoes, and that collectivity is the only thing possible in thefuture period brings us back to the relevant question: what is Mao's legacy? Is winning power on a path very different from that of the Russian Revolution of November, 1917, and the ISification of Marxism in revolution and in philosophy, a new variant of Russian Stalinist state-capitalism, or a truly historic, original path to that classless society which would, once and for all, put an end to the division between mental and manual labor which has ever been the ground of all class societies?

It was the form I raised in answer to a question of my analysis in "Mao's Last Hurrah" (4) a few days before Mao's death. Here is what I said in my Perspectives Report to the convention of News and Letters Committeee on Sept. 1 (see ad, p. 2, col. 1, for full report):

"There are some who say: "Yes, you are right when it comes to the U.S.-Russian struggle for hegemony; but is that the world must struggle against. But look at Mao's revolutionary thought."

"Why, the Chinese Revolution was not only the greatest revolution to emerge out of World War II, but ..."
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not only stopped the U.S. in its tracks in Korea; but so much does Mao move from revolution to revolution that he can make his own co-leaders and his own party and his own army. Although these revolutions had been with him during the Long March, they were paved the way for that most original and most massive of revolutions, Mao thinks only of the people, and not in Jess but in order to overthrow the Chinese people. Mao’s philosophy, in turn, is the future. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution points the way to the future.

GLOBAL POWER STRUGGLE MOTIVATES MAO’S PHILOSOPHY

OK, for the sake of argument, and that only, I will, with you, shut out of my mind the global struggle that is not at all limited to U.S.-Japan, but that crucial mass-massive power on earth—300 million Chinese. I will also declare myself that that massive power, being part of the Third World is the real focal point of revolution, can create the truth that Mao himself is the head of an existing state power that explains its own power, as do all rulers. I am even willing, for a moment, to blind myself to all reality, and listen, listen, listen only to Mao’s Thought, that the Cultural Revolution would put an end once and for all, to all division between mental and manual labor. I will take all Mao’s undisciplined verbiage for the only, the total truth.

OK, what is that Thought, what philosophy of pure, undetermined and continuous great proletarian cultural revolutions? It is, first, what it had been from the moment he started his most original path to military power by taking the peasant army Mao led on a different path than the proletarian revolution China faced, after which China continued his endless extermination campaigns against Mao’s army. Philosophically, it had blossomed as On Contradictions, where the core of the party power that explains its own power, as do all rulers. I am even willing, for a moment, to blind myself to all reality, and listen, listen, listen only to Mao’s Thought, that the Cultural Revolution would put an end once and for all, to all division between mental and manual labor. I will take all Mao’s undisciplined verbiage for the only, the total truth.

What was the essence of this in American terms? To give a political interpretation of the Chinese revolution, to escape the power struggle Mao’s mandate, including “radicalism” in China, and the lack of leadership in the communist movement. Mao, therefore, was able to escape the power struggle Mao’s mandate, including “radicalism” in China, and the lack of leadership in the communist movement. Mao, therefore, was able to escape the power struggle Mao’s mandate, including “radicalism” in China, and the lack of leadership in the communist movement. Mao, therefore, was able to escape the power struggle Mao’s mandate, including “radicalism” in China, and the lack of leadership in the communist movement. Mao, therefore, was able to escape the power struggle Mao’s mandate, including “radicalism” in China, and the lack of leadership in the communist movement. Mao, therefore, was able to escape the power struggle Mao’s mandate, including “radicalism” in China, and the lack of leadership in the communist movement.

SPOKEN REVOLUTIONS DESTROYED

BY MAO AND KHRUSHCHEV

It is a great question, to the fact that originally, i.e., in 1925, the world Communist Parties in Moscow with China very much in the forefront, “revolutionism” the earliest Communist revolutionaries who were fighting Russian nationalism against imperialism. At the same time, Mao was in a most brotherly embrace with the Russian revolutionaries in a country’s counter-revolutionary act. Indeed, Mao urged Khrushchev to send the Russian tank into Hungary to put down the revolutionaries. Mao, indeed, even philosophically, the “On Practice” which has been inseparable from the concept, “On Contradictions” in 1925, was not the practice of revolutionaries. Instead, this time, 1956, “How To Handle Contradictions Among The People” was accompanied by the practice of ordering the Chinese masses in full counter to what is called “the Leap Forward” which was so disastrous an act that even Mao had to step back from it 10 years later.

It is true, you, my critic, have one other original Mao concept—the Second World—and it is not coming in the 1950s but in the 1960s. This departure from Marxism is spoken of as if it were the needed bringing up-to-date of Marxism itself to a Mao’s Thought. This Mao Thought of the 1960s was developed during the Cultural Revolution, after Russia had already been declared “militant No. 1, after not only the removal of Liu (the Party man) but Lin (the Army man), and this though he had been the one who had initiated, carried through, and brought to a close the Cultural Revolution, for which he was judged to be the “closest collaborator-in-arms” of Mao, and named, within the Constitution itself, as the successor to Mao. It is a period when Mao and Mao alone, had absolute, undisputed, total power. And what was the source of this original, which came after all that travail and “continuous revolution”? It was the concept of the “Second World,” that is, to say, the industrialization nations, especially West Europe, especially Japan, and also medium-sized and smaller countries, anywhere in the whole wide world outside of the two superpowers. That exclusive two-fold evil is furthermore made exclusive—Russia was the more dangerous of the two superpowers.

Now, this concept, “Second World,” which heretofore everyone, Mao included, considered capitalist, was suddenly annexed as a possible ally of the Third World, recantiul China.

The rhetoric notwithstanding, “Second World” concept is the open, unapologetic, immediate, inter-continental revolution, redefining it with the narrowest nationalism “anti-imperialism” with global reach, even as the Cultural Revolution of 1966-76—philosophically, was not from theoretical precepts that, politically,iegian the class struggle and subordinate campaigns to political superstructure. In both historical periods—1937-49 and 1966-76—philosophically, Mao’s Thought emphasized generalization for social revolution into military strategy and tactics of attacking power.

For all existing powers in the power struggle Mao’s mandate, including “radicalism” in China, the only solution was for Mao to escape the power struggle Mao’s mandate, including “radicalism” in China, and the lack of leadership in the communist movement. Mao, therefore, was able to escape the power struggle Mao’s mandate, including “radicalism” in China, and the lack of leadership in the communist movement. Mao, therefore, was able to escape the power struggle Mao’s mandate, including “radicalism” in China, and the lack of leadership in the communist movement. Mao, therefore, was able to escape the power struggle Mao’s mandate, including “radicalism” in China, and the lack of leadership in the communist movement. Mao, therefore, was able to escape the power struggle Mao’s mandate, including “radicalism” in China, and the lack of leadership in the communist movement. Mao, therefore, was able to escape the power struggle Mao’s mandate, including “radicalism” in China, and the lack of leadership in the communist movement.

From the very first start of Mao’s new legendary Human Rights Report, followed by his Long March to escape the many extermination campaigns of China’s “On Contradictions” and “On Practice” which led to collaboration with Chiang, to the concept of the Second World, the military has been the determining factor. Even among Communist countries, Mao was the only one that raised the army, along with the Party, as the focal point for the new war as a theoretician of guerrilla warfare: as philosopher of Contradictions has held that on theory existed outside of On Practice, Mao somehow spoke of it. If it were a synonym for revolution, though clearly the On Practice he was talking about was not, was the practice of proletarian revolution. What Trotsky wrote of Stalin’s theories—"the emasculation of a革命"—is even more applicable to Mao, whose simple methodology is on the totally, absolutely, obviously the Hegelian-Marxist Absolute Method, the dialectic.

The dialectics of liberation will yet take the true measure of the man.

5) This does not exclude the fact that there may very well be, among the ruling elite, waiting for Mao to do, those who, despite a strong opposition to Russia, would rather not have Russia the enemy over U.S. imperialism, preferring equidistance from both. 
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Harrell is right when he says labor is "a cental to Marxist critical analysis" (my emphasis) — and totally wrong when he speaks of it as "the ultimate end" as if that were not Marx's specific description of capitalism, of "any" society. All that did was permit him to impose on Marx's "ambiguous" conception some sort of ideology to today's state-capitalist societies that call themselves Communist. Though Harrell feels compelled to qualify that allegedly theoretical affinity, holding that the "totalitarian society" "clearly violates its (Marx's) spirit," he never lets go of his preface definition.

Perhaps the most succinct way in which one could summarize Marxist political economy is: a theory of the development of workers' control as the prerequisite for a society based upon work.

Far from looking toward "a society based upon work" as an "ultimate end," Marx was so appalled by labor that he, at first, called for "the abolition of labor." And it was just when he realized that he had to concrete the concept, and call, instead, for "the emancipation of labor" that the sources, his class struggles, his daily resistance at the point of production, where the instrumentality, machinery, dead labor, dominated living labor. The revolt of the laborer against his exploiter, the capitalist, was also directed against the ideology, the false consciousness, which represented him as what he is not.

MARX'S CRITIQUE of classical political economy's great discovery that labor was the source of all value was that labor was treated only as "source," not as Subject, the "gravedigger" of the system resting on alienated labor. Naturally, workers' control of production would change that mode of labor, but for that to be the absolute opposite of capitalistic alienation of labor and its transformation of man into thing, labor has to become selfactivity, development not only of production,
TWO WORLDS: Self-emancipation and Marx

(Continued from Page 5)

an improvement on Marx's concept. Marx had spent a lifetime developing the concept of the duality of labor. It is "about" the only category Marx takes credit for creating.

"None before Marx had split the category, labor, but it is this, just this, which discloses the pervasiveness of the category of labor in one way or another," Marx writes in "The Labor Process," a key text for understanding Marx's concept of labor. Marx uses the term "labor" in a way that is different from the way it is used today. He uses it to refer to the activity of producing commodities, rather than simply to the act of working.

Marx, having followed the worker from the factory floor, to the market place, where the worker, through "free" labor, sold himself, or rather his ability to labor, labor power, as a commodity, proceeds to the workshop — the centerpoint of Marx's Capital is the analysis of "The Labor Process and the Production of Surplus-Value." There he traces the laborer as he is turned into an appendage of a machine. This dead labor (labor congealed into the form of machine) dominates living labor, after which "it" as commodity, be employed or unemployed, gets thrown back into the market. There — and this is not only the market place but includes the whole of bourgeois culture — "The Fetishism of Commodities" reigns supreme on top of capital/labor, and also over intellectual and social consciousness, including the consciousness of labor as the source of all value. This

(1) "The only other category Marx claimed credit for is the idea of surplus value. But Marx called it "surplus value" because it is a category of surplus capital, surplus commodity, surplus profit, surplus labor, surplus wage, surplus money."

This is not only the market place but also the whole of bourgeois culture — "The Fetishism of Commodities" reigns supreme on top of capital/labor, and also over intellectual and social consciousness, including the consciousness of labor as the source of all value.

is no accident, says Marx, as only "freely associated men" can strip the fetishism from commodities.

Obviously, Harrell thinks he is the exception and can give a more substantive view of freedom whose thought, as it moved to materialist 'politic economy,' was "no worse as to be irrelevant" and became "progressively narrower." To correct this, Harrell emulates the specificity of Marxian categories, introducing such total confusion into that most precise expression, "capital accumulation," as to make it both equivalent to bourgeois culture and acceptable to Marx since "bourgeois culture provides the necessary capital accumulation as well as the abstract (not as) as the ultimate end of universal freedom." On the way to his conclusion of the know-it-all, be-all "sensual needs," Harrell seems himself with what he conceives as support from "Critical Thought"... .

UNFORTUNATELY, THOUGH HIS sympathy line in the direction of the Frankfurt School, Harrell hardly presents a total picture of them, whether in relation to Marx or "as such." First he fails to show the division within. What they were in the 1950's and early 1970's, and what they became in the post-war years hardly makes a unified outlook — not totalitarian, even if it be added, but nevertheless mediated by Marxism, independent, and separate from both the German Social Democracy and the Russian "state socialism." Secondly, he acts as if the present "school" — the Heimann's "school" — that is altogether removed from both Marxism and the original Critical school, speaks with a single voice... .

Though he analyzes more of Marcuse's works as against none of Adorno's and little of Horwich, the founders of Frankfurt School, the truth is that his preoccupation is Eros and Civilization. Or, more precisely put, sensuality sans history, applicable to "all" cultures, as substitutes, not just for Marx's "economies" or "sociology" or passions, striving to reconstruct exploitative capitalism on humanist beginnings...

As for Harrell's dramatic climax, that the inclusion of "sensual needs" into "so-called-historical categories" would assure the demise of "unhappy consciousness"... "unhappy consciousness" resolves itself through the discovery of the actual in the form of its particularity... .

I wish him happiness. But let him not forget that the "unhappy consciousness" is only a quite early stage in Hegel's Phenomenology, and in Marx's new conceptions of thought and in critical thought to the present; there is a long, long road ahead.
TWO WORLDS

by Nina Berenatova
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

Editor's Note: We print below excerpts from a newly-reissued periodical Philosophic Letter by Nava Dienes, which appears to be the first Russian translation of the writer's work on the theme of the Sino-Soviet split. Copies of the complete letter can be obtained for $5.00 plus 15c postage from News & Letters. See ad p. 7

In a world beset by myriad crises and inescapable contradictions, one, I suppose, should not be surprised at the appearance of such absolute opposites as virtues selling like hot cakes over the corpse of Mao Tse-tung, and every country in the world, from the U.S. to Russia, from Chile to Japan, and from South Africa to Albania shouting out a unanimous chorus of glorification. The hypocrisy of this total outpouring was in no way pierced by the one-day unanimity among Mao's "commissioners-in-arm"—the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China—as those fighting heirs for Mao's mantle mounted the platform over Tian An Men Square, where a million had gathered for organized mourning. What did get everyone's attention was the speed with which victory came to one Hua Kuo-feng over Chiang Ching, Mao's widow and leader of the so-called radicals—in one short month.

THE RAPID VICTORY of Hua Kuo-feng over the major known tendency—Chiang Ching, Wang Hung-wen, Chiang Chun-chiao and Yao Wen-jian—makes his version of Mao's "Will" if any such exists, the one that pours out of all mass media. It is, however, first necessary to look at what Chiang Ching claims to be the "Will," not because that is necessarily any truer than Hua's version, but because one of these was circulated while Mao was still alive, whether or not he knew about it. . . . (1)

POST-MAO CHINA: WHAT NOW?

Far from acceding Chiang as "wild ambitions," Mao had already placed a warning and a way to continue the fight: "Human life is limited . . . In the struggle of the past ten years, I have tried to reach the peak of revolution, but I was not successful. But you could reach the top . . . If you fail, you will plunge into a fathomless abyss. Your body will shatter. Your bones will break . . . It will be necessary to wage partisan warfare once again." The final warning was against "foreigners." Just as the collapse of Chiang Kai-shek's Kuantzang was due to the belief in "foreigners," so she must beware of both the U.S. and Russia—"The bird and the northern star are equally to be distrusted."

Let us for the moment disregard that Stalin seems to fly in the face of the fact that Mao was the one who rolled out the red carpet for Nixon (and that after rid- ing himself of Liu Shao-chi's opponents that move); that Mao was the one who also invited Schlesinger to China the moment Ford fired him for resigning defense with Russia; and that, in that respect at least, Hua surely carried through Mao's "Will" and now has the U.S. government's promise to sell China the Cyber Computer which can easily be used for military purposes.

THE WILL WHICH Hua Kuo-feng refers to as "forced" refers not at all to the "Will" which was circu-lated back in the summer, at the very time when Teng was removed and Hua was designated as Teng's replacement. Instead, the accusation of forgery against Chiang Ching is based on the fact that she is supposed to have been "arrested while they were forging her's will on the transfer of political power. The group of conspirators were surrounded by security forces which, according to another reliable source, were composed of the personal bodyguards of Hua." (2)

Along with these dispatches from London and New York came one from Peking by the Le Monde correspon-dent, Alain Jacob, it quoted the People's Daily, Red Star, and Liberation Daily, all of which published a
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TANTALIZING is the fact that just before the removal of Teng (but when the campaign against him was already in full swing), there was such total concentration against "capitalist readers" that Mao once again (March 18, 1984) reprinted the struggle as one within the Communist Party: "A socialist revolution is being conducted without knowing where the bourgeoisie are. They are in the Communist Party."

Now, however, foreign policy is brought into the campaign against "the gang of four": "At the international level, it was planting to jettison the principle of proletarian internationalism and capitulate to imperialism." Whether Hua Kuo-feng and his cohorts meant to include "social imperialism," meaning Russia, was not clear.

There has always been no small amount of ambivalence on the question thrown in, most deliberately, throughout Mao's campaign of "Russia is Enemy No. 1." That was so during periods when all of the actual activity and relations aimed to favor the U.S. The fact that they want to have it both ways is pure Big Power politzik. We must instead see what flows logically from Mao's legacy. The fact that one can interpret the "Will" (no matter which Will one chooses) any way one pleases, testifies to one thing and one thing only, and it is not just a question of what the interpreter says. Rather it is the many gaps yaoe in Mao's heritage.

WHAT IS OF THE essence is not that he has not designated any one, single or collectively, as the "heir." It is that he has stripped all—no only those he physically eliminated—of any actual roots in the Chinese Revolution, or philosophy. Thus, it is not only those that he had first designated as "closest comrades-in-arms"—that Liu Shao-chi, as Party, then Lin Piao as Army—and then called traitors. It is that all history has been re-written that none exists with any historic past. Since the elimination was achieved, not via an open struggle to "two lines" that had once been a success, if not to the mass media, at least to the "cadres" of the Party, or the Army, or the State, but via de-classifying them to be "capitalist readers," and to have "al-ways" been that, there is no history other than that of Mao and Mao alone.

In a word, there is no history of the Chinese masses except as an abridgment. The history of the Chinese revolution is the Thought of Mao. None who now fight for the mantle have roots in either...
Editorial article

IS A NEW WORLD RECESSION COMING?

by Raya Dunayevskaya
National Chairman, News & Letters Committees

Even before Jimmy Carter was officially inaugurated President, he managed to violate every major promise he made during the election campaign. From the sharp slap in the face of the Black vote that elected him — his galling proposal that the racist Georgia judge, Griffin Bell, become Attorney General — to the total retreat on the economic front from his rhetorical full employment promise, there was no stopping the reactionary move backward. His own Secretary of Labor appointee, Ray Marshall, said he "would have opted for a much larger package of public works and housing . . . "

The so-called North-South dialogue — the relationship between the developed and underdeveloped countries—has also fallen victim to a new form of commodity fetishism. All it has produced are two new illusory phrases — "commodity power" and "commodity stabilization". Whatever illusions on the question of "commodity power" the OPEC countries have given the Third World with their daunting oil prices, namely, that any country can decide for itself the price it places on its commodity, the truth is:

First, oil and cocoa don't have the "power" of that crucial commodity, Oil. Furthermore, in the matter of raw materials, it is not the underdeveloped countries, but U.S. imperialism that would be the greatest profiteer, since it leads in production of vital materials and has the most valuable agricultural output. Indeed, "the American connection" has been distorted all others in capital and military power. As against "the French connection" on something, as common as crème, it creates the greatest subsidy for that which is closest to the capitalist's head—capital investment.

As opposed to the 1950s and early 1960s, when Western Europe attracted Western capitalism with its cheaper labor and U.S. technology, in the 1970s American capital has added a new incentive for world capital: a safe haven for its investments, now that European capital has decided the American proletariat is not as revolutionary as the European workers. As against the oil monopolists who are spending their billions on buying Western technology and military power, and whose actual investments in the U.S. are not directed to the capitalist goods market, West Germany, French and British capital is. However, so deep is the economic crisis in the U.S. and in the world that such European investment in the U.S. is, likewise, only a palliative.

The decisive failure is that U.S. capital has not expanded its plants and employment substantially; in fact, it is stagnating. Nor is U.S. capital planning to expand, as it complains about the falling rate of profit. It is here, just here, that Big Business is pressuring the Carter Administration for greater incentives for capital investment rather than the one-shot deal of a tax cut.

Let us, therefore, turn with sober senses to both the American economy, and see how worried Big Business and its ideological are about the so-called "puzzle" in the alleged economic upturn.

ALIENATED LABOR'S REALITY

Take Lawrence A. Viet, International Economist and Deputy Manager at Brown Brothers, Harriman & Co. (not to mention his previous position as economist at the State and Treasury Departments), who openly speaks of a "premature cyclical downturn" 1) rather than what Ernest Mandel calls "the generalized economic recession coming to an end in 1977." 2) Further, Viet points not only to the economic problems, but "the changing attitudes to work itself among the younger generation." Here it can already be seen that serious bourgeois analysts do see that the question of Alienated Labor is not "just theory." It is concrete. It affects the "cyclical downturn." Opposition to alienated labor has long been a fact (and not only among the younger generation), and has intensified since Automation first came onto the historic scene in the U.S. in 1950.

What we are presently experiencing is the worst of the five post-War recessions, along with the slowest post-War recovery which is no globally pervasive that the top bourgeois economists and industrialists fear it is not "sustainable" even at that low level of "recovery." Thus, the Economic Outlook, issued in Paris, Dec. 22 by the Secretary of the 26 million body of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, was gloomy even after they disregarded "the depressant influence of falling farm income," (which they expected would not repeat itself in 1977), and even after, as spokesmen for top rulers of the world, they were a great deal more worried about higher inflation than unemployment. Still, "to correct flagging growth rates" and inject sufficient stimulus, 5 percent economic growth would be needed; and that means, 240 billion! President-elect Carter, however, is projecting only 5 percent economic growth as his goal, and that would slide down to 4.5 percent by mid-year.

Now 3 percent (6 percent, for that matter) is a far cry from the 8 percent growth Carter projected during the campaign, when the high rhetoric also deviously spoke of "getting the country back to full employment." He is still saying that the present official 9.8 percent unemployment is "unacceptable," but "full employment" has completely dropped out of the rhetoric. The truth is that is precisely Marx's discernment of capitalism's "law of motion," that every greater expansion of constant capital as against living labor would bring it to its own collapse, that has been transformed from theory to grim reality. What has become grimment, and most threatening to capitalism's dominance, is that the army of unemployed has swelled to an unmanageable number as a permanent feature of the economy.

The "investment drought" is a great deal more than just "hesitation." What is interesting in the Foreign Affairs current issue's analysis of "The Troubled World Economy" is that it is working the West not to be overly happy with their "post-recyclers," that is to say, Big
Capital's way of realizing those billions, from the five-fold increase in wages from the Middle East and the 50% increase in living standard of the workers of that country, is sure to be offset by the increase in labor costs and the resulting increase in the price of consumer goods.

**VITAL LABOR POWER**

Even the most optimistic economists are aware that the centerpieces of the economy, the workers, the workers of the world, are in a state of crisis. The living standard of the workers in the United States is rising, but the price of consumer goods is rising as well. This is due to the increasing cost of labor, which is rising faster than the price of consumer goods.

**CAPITALIST INVESTMENT**

The increasing cost of labor is causing a decrease in capitalist investment. This is due to the increasing cost of labor, which is rising faster than the price of consumer goods. The decreasing profits of capitalist investment is leading to a decrease in capitalist investment.

**STATE AID FAILURE**

The state aid programs are failing. The workers of the world, the workers of the United States, are suffering from the increasing cost of living. The state aid programs are failing to provide adequate relief to the workers of the world. The state aid programs are failing to provide adequate relief to the workers of the United States.

Moreover, by now it is clear that the mode of production makes capitalist invest so much more for machinery and raw materials than for the workers it employs. The capitalist mode of production is producing a crisis for the workers, a crisis for the capitalist, and a crisis for capitalism. The workers are in a state of crisis, the capitalist is in a state of crisis, and capitalism is in a state of crisis.

(2) See Ernest Mandel's "A Holland, Uneven and Inflationary Utopia": "There can be no doubt the generalized recession of the International capitalist economy came to an end in 1976..." International Press, Nov. 30, 1976.


(5) Brief of Hegelian-Marxist dialectics, one can hardly escape trying to be in the analysis of today's  
coexistence of interests in the unification of labor and state  
-ideology, and thus inflect structuralism (and) the fatal  
problem in economics: in Marx's great new work, Capital, in our day, we have the situation where a new  
French translation of Capital is introduced by that official  
-Communist philosopher - Zinoviev - who  
"sought to glean pseudo-psychocatastrophe to improve his reputation  
against Marx's Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic as "the  
production-at-work, in opposition to the reduction of his (Marx's) "disordered" consciousness." And, for  
the English world, the beautiful new translation of Cap-

tal is hurled into an introduction by the Trotskyist  
philosopher - Ernest Mandel, who spreads himself over some  
76 pages of "introduction."
Notes from a diary: Roots, errors, and dialectics

MARCH, 1977

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION and Marxian and Freedom

The concerted way in which the mass media are trying to escape the consequences of the impact on the mass of the eight-day TV showing of Roots, has sent me back to the notes from my Diary on an entirely different subject and different historical period—1942, when Stalin tried to cover up the horrific roots, that is, the dialectical processes by which a product of labor assumes the specifically capitalistic value-form of a commodity. Just as the attempt, now, is being made not to make a category of slavery, reducing it to mere genealogy, so, then, Russian theoreticians, in revising Marx's theory of value, tried to make the historical subject (the exploited laborer) labor as an element of all production throughout history.

SLAVERY AND NEW TIMES

It is not that slavery and wage labor are identical, of course. It is that the two concepts—yesterday's slavery and today's racism, both integral to U.S. capitalism, on the one hand, and private capitalistic wage labor and state-capitalism collate itself Communism, on the other hand—react a point of equal irreconcilable contradiction with their Subjects, that the dialectics, of history, under the mass impact of the new times, erases all distinction between past and present, between concept and reality, between objective and subjective, and you desire to employ the existing society.

To try to blot that out, in Stalin's time, Stalin's theoreticians tried to null history back to "roots" beyond the pale, when they reviled Marx's theory of value and surplus value in order to question the Russian students were then saying: what precisely was different in a Russian factory from their "socialized labor" from that which Marx described in capitalistic England? In the same way, liberal journalists here today, even as the rulers in today's and yesterday's America, in sending the historic roots of slavery beyond the pale, whitewash the racism still coming out of every pore of "the American dream." And it isn't of course, only two different concepts that are being buried, but two different real and antagonistic worlds existing in the very same capitalistic America. Genealogy, individual genealogy at that, is a good way, they hope, to keep the racism of the present as deeply buried as the slavery of the past.

JOAN ROBINSON AND LITERARY STYLE

Just as the liberal journalists and historians today are busy explaining away Roots' impact on the audience, so my Diary reveals that it wasn't a question that the independent academicians in World War II didn't know the reality of Stalin's Russia, but that they nevertheless proceeded to explain away Stalin's startling revision of Marxism and break with the dialectical structure of Marx's Capital as the needed antidote to the alleged mystification of "Hegelian dialectics." I felt this especially strongly in my 1947 discussion with the great British academic economist, Joan Robinson, who had praised the "expose" I had published in the American Economic Review (September, 1944 and 1945), but whose affinity of ideas actually lay with the Russian economists on the question that the law of value operated also in a "socialist" or "capitalist" society. I therefore telegraphed her attention to what I thought was a not accidental: that she had left out a pair of parentheses in a quotation from Marx in his Essay on Marxian Economics. Specifically, this was a quotation from p.231 of Ch. 10, Vol. III of Capital, which in Marx's text reads:

"Only when production will be under the conscious and planned control of society, will society establish a direct relation between the quantity of social labor time employed in the production of different articles and the quantity of the demand of society for them." By having left out the parentheses, Joan Robinson made Marx's next series of sentences appear as if he were still talking of socialist production, as he correctly said: "the exchange or sale of commodities at their value is the rational way, the natural law of their equilibrium."

Joan Robinson got very upset as to why I had not brought the error to her attention, as the second printing of her Essay was going to press, I told I was sorry, but that it had never occurred to me that it was only a typographical error—it was just too ordinary an error for so serious a thinker to have made unless she literally didn't see, i.e., conceive it. On the other hand, as Hegel put it, "error is a dynamic of truth," and I hoped she would see that it was no simple matter of leaving out a
pair of parentheses, but the oh, so-serious dialectic for reading Marx. Naturally this made her angrier still: oh you Hegelian! That is exactly what was wrong with Marx. If only he had allowed Engels, who had a good "Avant-Boum" style, to write his Capital for him.

UPROOTING, OR FORGETTING?

Error, indeed, does not set as a "dynamic of truth" whose dialectics is enacted in the needed methodology, whether be by bourgeois thinkers or professor Marxists, What is at stake is the recreation, not so much of causal connections between past and present, unresolved by "errors," but of uprooting the existing society. It is the neglect of this, but this, concept of the dialectics of negation which, in fact, is at the root of mistakes when they are serious—and it is only when they are serious that they merit becoming subjects of controversy.

Paints recently (in the early 1970s rather than the 1960s), an error aroused my ire, again not because it was a matter of "watching" someone making a mistake, but of confronting a mistake which eroded both a concept and a whole page of history. I was reading Fred Halliday's first translation into English of Karl Korsch's 1925 Marxism and Philosophy, and 1930 Anti-Critique, and not jumped the reference to the German edition of Marx and Engels' Letters to Nikolai.**

For some 30 years, I have borne in silence the vulgar bourgeois scholarship's disregard of Russian history, specifically on the topic of Rosa Luxemburg's supposition revolutionary manner of unifying the names of dissidents of the Tsarist regime. In 1913, when she had written her greatest theoretical work, Accumulates of Capital, she devoted Ch. XX to Nikolai-on. By the 1920s, when "the West" first started paying attention to her work, "Russians" took for granted that everyone knew that there was no such name; that the position before the "ten," signified that the name was not spelled out, but was the ending of any common name; and that, in fact, the name was Danielson, Nikolai Danielson, a great Marxist editor and the first editor of Marx's work in Russian (1878-1879).

When Oxford University Press, after a lapse of nearly 40 years, finally published Rosa Luxemburg's Accumulates of Capital in English translation, I was shocked to find that, despite my efforts to the translation is by no less a scholar than Dr. A. Koster, the reference to the "ten" was left in, and the ending of any common name, and that, in fact, the name was Danielson, Nikolai Danielson, a great Marxist editor and the first editor of Marx's work.** Moreover, the name of Ch. XX was left in, and the name of Nikolai Danielson was not included.

With all this accumulation of erudition and high regard for Rosa Luxembourg, a "technical" error of such vast dimensions as to illuminate, nothing short of the authoritarian era of Tsarist censorship could only. It seemed to me, be due to the capitalistic class character of the new discoverers of Rosa Luxembourg's work. Unfortunately, it was not limited to the bourgeois scholars.

In 1968, the Monthly Review Press reproduced it as is." And, in 1970, in an entirely different work published by New Left Books, the German disregard of Russia's theoretical contribution is so total, that even an independent Marxist at Khror Korsch refers to "the outstanding introduction by the editor Kurt Mattelbaum to the German edition of Marx and Engels' Letters to Nikolai." By then, I had sent off an article to Fred Halliday, the editor of Korsch's work, stating that it was one thing for bourgeois academics to make such errors, but for Marxists to do so displays more than forgetfulness of a page of history; it is the dialectics of present history that is the issue. After some delay, I did finally get an acknowledgement from Fred Halliday, to the effect that he had turned my letter over to the publisher. There has been no second edition of Korsch's work, but why could a correction not have appeared in the New Left Review?: The "New Left", as the old and new academicians, is no bereft of seriousness towards dialectics, be it of roots or errors, be it of history, past and present, that they all end up by tantalizing some state power. Which is why, "East", or "West", emblems are so far removed from the dialectics of liberation.

In a way, Joan Robinson's Preface to the second edition of her Essay on MARJAN Economics says the same thing when she holds that Marx's "radical analysis can be separated from its unexploitable ideology," and, again, when she talks of Marx's "nineteenth-century metaphysical habits of thought," and of his "tending to the Hegelian dialectics." What came out more sharply in our conversation (and in her monograph on State-Capitalism and Marxism), was the direct reference to Hegel and Marx, her "taking sides" with the "radical" turn, not with the new Marxist scholars who defend the whole question of the law of value and "labor," as well as the dialectical structure of capital, was seen as more accidental than her "taking sides" with the "enemies" in China during the Cultural Revolution. See her commentary on my first draft of Marxism and Freedom, which was called State-Capitalism and Marx-

New Essays: new unity of theory and practice

APRIL, 1977

TWO WORLDS.

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

Editor's Note: Raya Dunayevskaya is giving her column over this issue to a letter from a colleague concerning her latest pamphlet. See 66, p. 9.

Dear Raya,

I have just finished reading your New Essays for the first time as a totality, and felt that I had to write you this note, because I had been so impressed with Philosophy and Revolution, especially with Chapter One on Hegel, that I didn't think anything could add to it, in its universality and concreteness. But what you have achieved in "Dialectics of Liberation: Absolute Negativity as New Beginning" is so new that for the first time I see what the term "new" you are always using really means.

So limited is the essay to one single chapter of Hegel's Science of Logic — the final one, "Absolute Idea" — so rigorous and textual is it, moving paragraph by paragraph through those final 21 paragraphs of the Logic, that at first sight it would seem that to concrete — or "political" — conclusions could be revealed. But in fact, what I came to understand by the time I reached your conclusion is that the newness is not alone in relation to ourselves as revolutionaries and as Marxists, but even in relation to Hegel himself.

NONE OF THE Hegelians, whether of the "non-political," variety, or those thus considered themselves socialists — like Theodore Adorno, who have been able to see the concrete idea as a pleasure, not as conclusion, but as the mediation that creates an immediacy. From the very beginning of his essay, your insistence that "the Absolute Idea is a new beginning, a new beginning that is inevitable, precisely because the Absolute Idea is a 'concrete totality,' and thus entails differentiation and impasse to transcend," arrest me as the new ground on which to work through Absolute Idea — by subordinating it to Hegel's own method.

This would have to see in the dialectic no separation between Absolute Form, the Method, the Notion, all revolving around the pivot of "universal absolute activity." No longer can it be vulgarly said that Marx "revolutionized" the Hegelian dialectic. Instead, Marx's actualization of the dialectic as "a new Humanism" is seen as the realization of a philosophical method that was already revolutionary — and which drew its revolutionary passion not from speculation, but from 2,300 years of the history of the struggle for freedom — even if "only" as the freedom of the Idea — crystallizing in the great French Revolution.

The truth is that, even if one wished to call what you have accomplished here a "re-statement" of Hegel, it would be a "restatement" unlike any that has been created up to this historic moment. While Hegel constantly stressed the necessity of considering things "in and for themselves," generations of those studying his method — academics and Marxists seeking to "apply" the dialectic — have missed the source of that method's explosive energy. Their failure stands out all the more starkly when one considers the clarity with which you express it: "The point is that it is the power of the negative which is the creative element; it is not the synthesis, but the absolute negativity which assures the advance movement."

The height is reached in the last paragraph of the entire Science of Logic, which even Lenin skipped over in his Philosophical Notebooks, saying "further till the end of the page is unimportant." You have proved that what Hegel is stating in that last paragraph is what he will not "show" until he writes the first three syntheses of Philosophy of Mind (paragraphs 303, 304, 307) in 1830. In doing so, you have brought in both the movement from practice and the movement from theory. In other words, you have shown that Hegel is here anticipating himself.

IS THE ANSWER to why you were able to see this anticipation, where Hegel scholars who had spent their lives could not, the same reason that you are demanding that all attention be paid to the third synthesis (paragraph 307) where "Logic has been replaced, and in its stead we get, not the sequential, but the consequential Self-Thinking Idea"? In other words, does the dialectical distinction lie in the opposition between Absolute Negativity as Absolute Method and every other method of thought in which substance rules, even when substance is as high as the system itself?

This whole question of Hegel's "anticipating himself" has really set me to thinking, both backward to the
process of your coming to such ideas and "forward" to Mao’s death and today’s headlines on China. The work that I have been doing with your archive has been tremendously revealing of the “labor, patience and suffering of the negative” that revolutionary theory must undergo if it is to meet — and in this case “meet” must also mean “anticipate” — the movement from practice. After working with your 1963-65 philosophic correspondences, I am convinced that the phrase “it is no accident” fails completely to explain your discovery of a movement from practice in your "Letter on Hegel’s Absolute Idea" six weeks before the East German masses gave that movement a world reality in their June 17, 1953 revolt against Russian totalitarianism.

THERE IS ANOTHER sense in which I was impressed by the "immediacy" of your essay. I felt more that it is only because you have penetrated so deeply into philosophy that you have been able to see the biggest headlines as anticipation — not the crystal-ball kind, but as theorectic preparation for each new moment, and for revolution itself. Take the essay which begins the pamphlet: "Post-Right China: What Now?" It was written just a month after Mao’s death, yet has both a scope and a specificity which still escapes the China commentators.

If anything was needed to show philosophy's importance, it is the contrast between your essay and Julian Jackson's "Notes on Mao’s Death" in the current New Politics. Jackson certainly thinks he agrees with you — politically. But in reading his piece, you don’t get any idea why Mao had ever achieved the great national revolution he undeniably headed. There is a failure to see either the peasants as revolutionary force, or the appreciation of philosophy in the depth of the idea of freedom which makes you believe that one person can really be 10,000.

This is exactly what Mao means in the Great Leap Forward, and what makes his counter-revolution the worst of all state-capitalisms. Far from national revolution representing for Mao a necessary moment in the path to world revolution, thought and action divide totally when Mao assumes state power. By the time his refusal to back Nasser as U.S. bases are piling down on that country exposing him, the Chinese revolution has been transformed into a national state-capitalism fighting for global mastery, whose "socialism internationalism" turns out to be a new imperialism. If the new beginning with which you face the crisis of our nuclear age is anything less than Absolute Negativism, there is every sort of counter-revolution waiting for you... .

THIS IS THE ground of the Trotsky essay as well. Not that Trotsky was ever a counter-revolutionist or reformerist. You show him as a great man and a great bolshevik revolutionary. Yet Trotsky’s "permanent revolution" doesn’t end up equalling world revolution. Especially where the peasantry is centered, self-movement, self-determination fall before the immovable substance of their "inability in an independent political role, and even less a leading role."

Just two points on your exchange with Mandel printed after the Trotsky essay: I felt the phrase "Mao" made me laugh, as his position changes three times in as many paragraphs. I am sure there is the closest relation between these attitudes and his disgraceful introduction to the new British edition of Marx’s Capital. Everyone should read your critique of it. I also couldn’t get over the male chauvinist arrogance. It is really so astonishing when the Fourth International’s supposed "internationalism" of Women’s Liberation is exposed by their biggest theoretician’s own system.

Freeden, Michael Connelly

* Available in “The Rosa Luxemburg Foundation” on deposit at Wayne State University. A guide can be ordered from News & Letters for $1.

** Political Philosophical Letter, "Today’s Global Crises and Marx’s Capital," available from News & Letters for $2 (See ad, p. 6).
Tony Cliff degrades Lenin as theoretician

MAY, 1977

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION and Marxism and Freedom

The second volume of Tony Cliff’s three-volume study of Lenin, which has just been published, is a most curious compilation, though entitled, All Power To The Soviets, and although it follows the first volume which already has appeared, it is no less curious, it is that same speculative theme that permeates Volume II as well. Indeed, the foreword explains that the reason for the book, when Trotsky’s monumental History of the Russian Revolution had already covered that period so magnificently, is that the latter’s “serious defect” is that it did not tell the story of the Bolshevik Party’s fight for power, its rapid rise, its internal, its local committees, its Central Committee.” (p. 14)

So weighted down is Tony Cliff with the concepts of the vanguard party to lead and the “collective leadership,” that he does not delve so much as to remind the philosophical Leninist of how Lenin experienced the shock of the simultaneous onset of World War I and the collapse of the Second International.

The Chronology does list “22 August—5 September: Lenin arrives in Bern (Switzerland)—and then proceeds to mention that Lenin presented his thesis on war to a Bolshevik conference, but rather, more to the whole 471 pages of text, Notes, and Index, is there a single reference to Lenin’s active role in the Moscow Secretariat of the Bolshevik party. (p. 164) It is quite possible that Lenin’s “Abstract of Hegel’s Logic” was completed (1) after which followed 1913 and more “On Dialectics” and everything from Imperialism to Marxism and the State, the first version of State and Revolution.

ON JANUARY 21, 1915, Lenin addressed a letter to Encyclopaedia Britannica which he had written the essay, “Karl Marx.” He was trying to end it in order to make “certain corrections in the section on dialectics.” I have been studying this question of dialectics for the last month and a half and I could add something to...


...if there was time...” Evidently there was no time—or at least there was no time—to allow Lenin to make his corrections, much less to try to figure out what had happened in those six works in Lenin’s thought. No doubt it was hard to understand why Lenin, in his mind of a world holocaust, was so preoccupied with dialectics.

Sixteen years later, a Marxist theoretician like Tony Cliff is still so little concerned with Hegelian dialectics that he fails to see its relevance either to Lenin or Marx—or Imperialism, to which he does devote Chapter 6. That chapter is the perfect proof that empiricists who are free of methodological concerns appreciate methodology in others because they so totally devote themselves to their theoretical vision. Thus, Tony Cliff informs us that “in terms of the actual description of modern capitalism, Lenin is not original at all, and borrows practically everything from Bukharin.” (p. 61) This is not a statement on what Lenin “owed to the people who had studied modern capitalism before—above all Hilferding and Hilferding.” (p. 61)

That happens to be exactly what bourgeois economists—who have never pretended to be concerned with dialectics as have Marxists (either as philosophy or as revolution)—have always contended. Tony Cliff does them one better by drawing the further conclusion that “the difference between the two books (Bukharin’s and Lenin’s on Imperialism) is radical—a difference between a theoretical treatment on imperialism and a political pamphlet on the same subject.” (p. 61)...

THE FOUNDATION for this degradation of Lenin as theoretician is, in fact, laid in Vol. I (p. 230) where Cliff writes: “It was barely an exaggeration for the Bolshevik historian M. N. Pokrovsky to write: ‘You will not find a single fully theoretical work; each has a propaganda aspect.’” In Vol. II, Cliff not only leads up to Chapter 6 by telling us (in the chapter on the National Questions that “many of the leading economists in Russia did not understand why Lenin was so vehement in his opposition to Bukharin”, p. 86) but in the very chapter on Imperialism he-links to Lenin’s Will (12/22/12/1922) to quote Lenin on Bukharin as the “biggest and most floridian,” without so much as mentioning that a fully Marxist, for there is something scholastic in him (the text has never been published or understood, the dialectic). What is this dialectic that made Lenin say—and not just in a polemical way, but in his Will—that his...
lin co-leader. Bukharin, who had never betrayed, who was always a revolutionary, who was, in fact, "the favorite of the whole party" and a "major theorist," was "not fully a Marxist" because he had "never really understood the dialectic". The very work that Tony Cliff considers so theoretically superior to Lenin's popularization was the one that Lenin had first introduced favorably but after grappling with Hegel's dialectic, found no non-dialecticalist that he undertook any study. Secondly, and foremost, Lenin found Bukharin's opposition to self-determination not just benefits of the "dialectic of history", but as the "essence and impediment to working with new national revolutionary forces, such as the Irish revolutionaries who designated Bukharin's position as nothing short of "imperialist communism".

**TONY CLIFF'S SINGULAR EXPERIENCE:**

Tony Cliff's singular experience — like all empiricism, bereft of all methodology — is beyond comprehension of Lenin's theory — theory, not just a "popular outline." By leaving out Lenin's Philosophical Notebooks, Cliff not only skips over "philosophy", but the dialectics of liberation as self-developing subject, that is to say, the actual masses in revolt. Thus by no accident whatever, the chapter on the "National Question", on which Cliff is supposed to agree with Lenin, not Bukharin, has not a word to say about the Irish Revolution, which was the concrete "topic" under discussion. What was decided were the revolutionaries. Their appearances on the historic stage had sharpened in a fever pitch all the tendencies fighting Lenin's position.

This was not the Austrian Socialists in the 19th century (where Tony Cliff chooses to begin), nor even Poland, 1912, when the National Question was still debated just as "philosophy", as "theory", or the Bund, though he still keeps away from referring to the Easter Rebellion, Cliff is finally forced to quote Lenin: "The dialectics of history are such that small nations, powerless as an independent factor in the struggle against imperialism, play a part as one of the forces, one of the factors, that in the real anti-imperialist forces, the socialist proletariat, to make its appearance on the scene.

But meanwhile they hadn't. 1917 was still to be. And when it did come it was preceded by Lenin's State and Revolution that was first begun in those critical years, 1914-15, when Lenin was grappling with Hegel's dialectics, they were, as political, as economic, as self-developing Subject, "The dialectics proper" extend from the basic living tree of living, fertile, genuine, powerful, conscious, objective, absolute human knowledge because "it is impossible to grasp Marx's Capital, and especially its first chapter, if you have not studied and understood the whole of Hegel's Logic. Consequently, none of the Marxists for the past half century have understood Marx!" By eliminating this from his study of Lenin, it is no wonder that Tony Cliff reaches the climax of his comprehension — I mean, non-comprehension — of Lenin by citing out Lenin's "uncomprehensible"... a period of great changes, the number of unknown factors, not only in the enemy camp, but also in our own, is so great that sober analysis alone will not suffice. An unsurpassed ability to detect the mood of the masses was Lenin's most important gift."

What then of Cliff's indispensable party to lead? Ah, Cliff brings it all back in the penultimate paragraph: "The crux of October furnished the supreme test of his (Lenin's) strategy, and of the calibre of his leadership of the party and the class."

(1) When Moscow finally published Lenin's Philosophical Notebooks in English in 1961, they not only left out Adorno's Introduction to the first Russian edition of 1909, but also the Lenin Institute's listing of what books Lenin called for or just in Breve, 1914-15, but in absence after taking power. It bears repeating. Adorno: "Despite the fact ..., of the extreme situation and the necessity to give all attention and all energy to practical questions. Lenin continued to interest himself in questions of philosophy. This is evident from his readings ... on June 24, 1911 he asked for a Russian translation of Hegel's Logic and Phenomenology of Mind ... Lenin not only read but wrote on the question and philosophy. Nine-tenths of the remarks on Bukharin's Economics of the Transition Period concern the question of method."

(2) Cliff picks out the quantitative fact of "166 books, 350 articles" that Lenin read and annotated, but says not a single word that while preparing the pamphlet he had read Phenomenology of Mind, much less any attempt to dig into the abbreviated "popular outline" to see there such dialectical principles as "transformation into opposition", or the relationship between Hegel's "attitudes to objectivity", and Lenin's analysis of these "either-sides" that Lenin "went on" to do.

(3) In Vol. 1, Cliff does have one single reference (p. 232) to "dialectics term and Lenin's Philosophical Notebooks" at the point where he criticizes Materialism and Empiriocriticism. One would have thought that, even if Cliff had no time for concretizing his terse single statement on the Notebooks, his preoccupation with the Party should have led him to see that, Stalinian detractors notwithstanding, Lenin himself had not written on "partisanship of philosophy." Instead, Cliff's point is that it was supposedly only "in the period of reaction after the revolution" that "Marxist philosophy inevitably came to the fore". (Vol. 1, p. 288) No wonder he could not see the Notebooks, as Lenin's philosophical preparation for revolution."
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Smile but be armed—and think the unthinkable

Carter recreates sedative for nuclear proliferation and economic crises

What was little recorded in the press, which was too busy stirring up the hallucinogenic fumes of Carter's "summit success," is that one genuine U.S. imperialist victory Carter could possibly ever achieve thephony summit at 10 Downing Street. As soon as that front show was over, he took off for a NATO meeting where the real policy is set: ever greater armament, new weaponry ordered and slaughtered planned.

Carter not only called attention to Russia's "essential strategic nuclear equivalence" with the U.S. but stressed Russia's "offensive posture." Thereupon, NATO Secretary General M. A. Luns followed with a description of the over "bulldozer" Russian "infusions abroad" of northern Norway "to the point that a submarine recently entered the North Sea."

Carter called for the need to create more precision guided missiles and insisted that, at no matter what cost, preparations for the new technology of the 1980s must start now. Thereupon NATO's second commander in the Atlantic Ocean, Admiral核酸 C. Scudellari, was empowered to draw up "contingency plans" for operations beyond the present alliance boundary of the Trucial States. Whether that is to "protect" all tankers from the Persian Gulf bound for Europe and the U.S., or for purposes of Western "reassurance," the global plan works out all too efficiently.

Clearly, Carter's call to "combine, coordinate and connect" all defense programs not only with uncommitted allies but with the Soviet Union too, was in contradiction to the pattern of the U.S. that has been at work for the past 10 years, i.e., using how to shore up NATO's flatly underfully in Portugal. He was first to seek his money and "political base" to the present "Seamount" Prime Minister Socrates, and thus to assure military bases to NATO.

CARTER A SUCCESS AT NATO:

Schmidt the Victor at Summit

Carter is hardly waiting for a "peace" of that, or his own 1980's weaponry of the 1980's, but at once called for the "peace" proposed in West Germany, which remains the key point of the International situation for all war mongers, be it for "conventional" wars or a nuclear world holocaust. World War III, instead of America, Stux, and Israel troops, as presently, being based west of potential battle area, are to move closer to the frontier between West and East Germany.

Finally, when he concluded his total success at NATO, with those he commanded, was that, far from seeking West Europe to "bear its share of the cost" as pre-summit promises, but it, Carter assured one and all that the U.S. would "continue" the support and reinforcement of the U.S. "preference" there, including, above all, its nuclear umbrella.

This didn't mean that the West Europeans rulers (Japan for that matter) would rely on that nuclear umbrella alone, much less be ordered about by the U.S. military centers, hallucinating Germany's Helmut Schmidt, one and the same time, not only announced that he was going to appeal with the $4.2 billion nuclear reactor deal with Israel, but that Germany itself would accept $6.7 billions for nuclear "research." Supposedly this was for peaceful purposes, as part of alternative energy sources not dependent on oil, but in fact, it frees Germany from total reliance on the U.S. nuclear umbrella.

After hitting out at Carter before the conference, and combining with his own attitude, the other world leaders said that, of course, he "understands" Carter's aim to see that there is no access to super-power technology that could lead to atomic arm manufacture by "evil-minded countries that evade international control." But, of course, neither that nor NATO nor the militaristic regimes in Latin America is selling nuclear reactors to are "evil-minded."

It isn't that Carter was "shaken up" by such statements. The real reason the summity of the seven nations at 10 Downing Street May 7 decided not to touch that divisive issue is the totality of the economic crisis which they have no way of getting out of as it is, much less if they dared stop the export of nuclear reactors. No less than 10,000 West German jobs now depend, directly and indirectly, on the construction of these nuclear power stations. This is equal to the number involved in the national aerospace industry complex. In a word, what employment there is heavily dependent on militarization, including atomic.

The economic turbulence that lies ahead, as well as the which undermines it now, the undercurrent of revolt that led to such near total revolutions as the Portuguese, the Russian nuclear buildup which will hardly stop anymore than the U.S. even if there is a SALT deal, is what else relates to Helmut Schmidt's induced victory at 10 Downing Street. Politically, too, he was in advance of his political allies, decided, i.e., saying how to shore up NATO's flatly underfully in Portugal. He was first to ask for money and "political base" to the present "Seamount" Prime Minister Socrates, and thus to assure military bases to NATO.

The 1,000 journalist TV correspondents and other mass media people, which were in London for the conference, followed the day-to-day- President Carter-around whenever he went, but hardly asked Carter any embarrassing questions. About the war, friends, and the press, Carter did not ask for money and "political base" to the present "Seamount" Prime Minister Socrates, and thus to assure military bases to NATO.

EURO-COMMUNISM

Even such permanent, absolute economy, which has kept capitalism from collapse, is only deluding the day of reckoning. It has not halted the permanent unemployed army, or the ever-rising inflation, much less the undercurrent of revolt which is constantly breaking out into the open, and presently demolishing the Establishment in Western Europe and in Japan. It is this which has had Carter constantly melting away from every point he had announced before the summit, from trying to control nuclear proliferation, from talking of upholding "human rights."

Yet, though Carter was enough gave up having any such statements included in the official communiques, and though he kept up the pressure that he is not worried about Euro-Communism—each country has a
right to have a government of its choice, he said with a smile—the fact was that, in one and the same time, both he and his military bases in Spain and Portugal, and encouraging it to align with his far right to make sure that the French SFIO coalition does not come to power.

The truth is, for the so-called common goal of trying to maintain economic growth, lower inflation, and new something to stop the constantly expanding unemployed army, that is running out for capitalism, as well as to the United Nations. The overriding fact of capitalism, the world capitalism, is stagnation. Stagnation of economic growth, stagnation of employment, stagnation of policies. As Stalin had said: "The problem of unemployment and especially unemployment among the youth of the economic system." The United Nations called the "stagnation, decay, a system that has long outlived its usefulness.

To help West Europe look white when in fact it is going to be black, Carter gave in, first to West Germany, then to France, and also tolerated Italy. The crisis are just too many, even if one disagrees what happened directly after that summit which included meetings also with Nixon and a meeting of "peace in the Middle East" only to be confronted with Israel moving to the far right in its election and another Arab-Israeli war looming ahead. The referring conflict between Greece and Turkey over Cyprus likewise relates to go away.

And should it be possible to put all those conflicts, plus the use and round of the Trade talks, on the back burner, there is still the overriding fear of the conflict which includes meetings with Nixon and a meeting of "peace in the Middle East", only to be confronted with Israel moving to the far right in its election and another Arab-Israeli war looming ahead. The referring conflict between Greece and Turkey over Cyprus will have to go away.

The problem is to find a solution that can be acceptable to all sides. The United Nations has for many years been trying to find a solution, but without much success. The current situation in the Middle East is very tense, with Israel and Lebanon fighting over the control of the Golan Heights.

The Russian rulers turned the real target; the rumor that the U.S. may sell arms to China: "The leaders of the military-industrial complex of U.S. West Germany, Japan, and some other capitalist countries are actively discussing the possibility of supplying China with arms and military equipment," leaked this to the "apartheid" which brought on World War II, the implication becomes unmistakable: if the West "doesn't do anything", does not sell arms to China, will it not be able to do anything. Indeed, the so-called "neutral" or "cold" war negotiations on SALT are a great deal more related to whether or not China is succeeding in arranging deals with the West than to the "disappearance" with Carter's rhetoric of "neutralization.

The one thing that distinguishes the "pragmatic West" from the supposedly "dynamic East" is that the latter does try to theorize about its pragmatic imperialist thrusts. April has been a month of such balance sheets since April 25, the birth of Lenin, had been used by China, in 1905, to announce the public opening of the Sino-Soviet Conflict. In 1977 it was used by Russia to declare its new selling at Euro-Communism as the gifts from 15 CPs met in Czechoslovakia under auspices of World Marxist Review.

The month of April was taken up with preparing "theoretical" ground, at one and the same time, for fighting post-Neo China leadership and scowling at Euro-Communism which they had "provocatively" nearly "approved".

Now there was an attack on "nationalist deviations" from needed "international solidarity." The most significant of all was the fact that this theory was by no means limited to the theoretical journal. Quite the contrary. The practices which are so important as any in the pragmatic West, got "theorized" and once militarized. And that it was that the scowling at Euro-Communism (with its own "internationalism" made as charismatically clear as possible), and the attack on China, that resulted in kind, was restated in the Armed Forces daily, Red Star.

BACK HOME

As if Russian earth rattling wasn't disturbing enough, U.S. imperialism did some of its own and not only engaging in war, but toppling one after the other:

- To the rescue, giving the West its "higher calling" came none other than the energy-card, 2400 2500 Btu of Energy. If defense of Carter's energy proposals as if they weren't all directed against the masses for the military to Minister said: "President Carter's new energy plans can't work, that's why he's in the world nuclear lobby."

He then followed this up by stating that the only energy proposals were directed was to the right. He insisted that this was not a question of Left–Right, or Labor–Capital, but simply "energy policy" and, while the Labor Party Minister was all for "democracy", nevertheless, "Carter's got put the apple back into the bottle, or the plutonium back into the uranium.

The re-examination, unfortunately, is not for purposes of deciding what to do either about unemployment or inflation or the North–South Dialogue, but only to excuse the continued proliferation of atomic energy by both West Germany and France, by both the U.S. and Japan, by Britain and by both China and Africa and other frequent narrow nationalism that are still very much lacking in the unmentionable, without any camouflage a new world slaughter.

—Naya Duvekandya
Chairwoman, National Editorial Board
Chiang Ch'ing, Hua Kuo-feng in post-Mao China

JULY, 1977

TWO WORLDS

by Naya Demusovskaia
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

The first of the four tasks the new Communist Party Chairman, Hua Kuo-feng, set for China for 1977 was "to deepen the great mass movement to expose and criticize the gang of four". This is the central task. (1)

In its prefatory note to the speech, Peking Review stressed that "1977 will be a year in which we shall smash the gang of four completely.

SMASH, SMASH, SMASH

It is not that Hua's speech to that point needed any further emphasis, as he devoted no less than 90% of the 10-page speech at the Second National Conference on "Learning from Tachai in Agriculture" to that point. Furthermore, point two, "to strengthen Party building", likewise turned out to be a vividification of the four former leaders—Wang Hung-wen, Yao Won-yan, Chang Chun-chiao, and Chiang Ch'ing who is alleged to have been the ring-leader who had taken advantage of Mao's wife to mislead 800 million Chinese, in three many years.

Here is how he wound up the whole of the speech and thus the two remaining tasks—"to learn from Tachai" to drive "to push the national economy forward," and finally "to study conscientiously and well the works by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and Chairman Mao's work"—"immediately after smashing the gang of four and implementing the Communist Party's decision on the publication of the Selected Works of Mao". Hua then singled out from the new Volume V—essentially written from 1949 to 1957—"Chairman Mao's brilliant work, On the Ten Major Relationships (2) which is "to guide all" in the fight against Russian revisionism and "the smashing of the gang of four."

The way Hua edited that volume, especially that "entitled" article, is a tale unto itself of which we will return later to see if there is any connection whatever between Chiang Ch'ing and this article which supposedly will add us in "smashing the gang of four." Here, instead, it is necessary to start "at the beginning":—1962—the year that Chiang Ch'ing singled out as so crucial that she very nearly dated the "Cultural Revolution" at that time, adding only as an afterthought, that, "of course, the real beginning was the summer of 1966 since that is when the masses began the Cultural Revolution.

Now, what was so crucial about 1962? I don't mean its significance insofar as the annals of Chinese Communist history, which read 1962 as the Socialized Education Campaign. I mean its significance for Chiang who felt very much discriminated against and underestimated in her own right rather than just the wife of Mao.

CHIANG CH'ING AND THE TALE SHE TOLD

It is true that when she began her story—"Let me dissect myself before you!"—Chiang starts with her childhood and details all her suffering. The "true story" is also that she was a revolutionary long before she came to Tienan, and married Mao. And once she became the dominant force in the arts during the Cultural Revolution, she sought vengeance on those Communist leaders who hadn't given her her due in the 1950s.

But what predominated in all her actions and ambitions was to be a leader in Mao's eyes, and in 1962, for the very first time, Hua permitted her to draft a policy statement on the arts known as May 16th Circular (p. 304). That, then, becomes the year one self-develops successfully.

(1) Peking Review, January 1, 1977. It is also reprinted in China Quarterly, March 1977. Evidently this conference on "Learning from Tachai in Agriculture" was followed by another "Learning from Tachai in Industry," and there Hua projected no less than "10 more officials to be built.

(2) China Quarterly, March 1977, carries both On the Ten Major Relationships, as edited by Hua and thus now the official versions of the Mao Tse-tung speech of April 26, 1948, and a comparison of it and other versions by Stuart R. Schram.

When one considers that it was after those two decisive years, followed also by what is called " tariff protective " work in land reform and marriage reform, that, as her health failed completely and she was shunted between hospitals in Peking and Moscow, she was stripped in 1951 of all her posts, one must conclude that there is a greater rate against Mao as male chauvinist than ever there was against Chou Yang in the 1930s upon whom Chiang wreaked her vengeance.

Again, it was not a bourgeois feminist but a great revolutionary writer and feminist—Ting Ling—who dared challenge Mao directly both in Yenan and in the 1930s, and who summed up the fate of those leaders' wives in a single phrase, "Women who came home." (4) (To be concluded next issue)

(4) Boen's Dell's House enjoyed popularity in Japan, and the heroine Nora who smashed the door on housewifery was used by Ting Ling in her piece on International Women's Day, "Thoughts on March Eighth," where she saw wives of leaders as cruelly taken advantage of as they became "Nora who return home." The best pamphlet on Ting Ling, Purged Feminist was issued in Japan (Feminist Press, 2562, Tokyo). When American feminists who themselves suffer from "feminism tarre anything by her, one as feminist journal published in Chicago (June, Autumn 1938 issue) did, the "exploratory" role is disgusting as they try to conclude that, through right, Ting Ling was nevertheless evidently wrong, or unfairly, or whatever.

Part II

(Continued from last issue)

Chiang Ch'ing rode the crest of the so-called Cultural Revolution, and untended over the arts, directly into the very core of Party-Army-State power—membership into the Politburo. By the time of Lin Piao's downfall and Mao's complete reversal of Sino-American relations when he rolled out the red carpet for Nixon in 1972, Chiang took advantage of the pre-eminence in China of the hub of U.S. imperialism,顺畅地. In the story's first blood, let us look out one Lin Biao, Su Lien Wike, Professor Wike had been commissioned to report on "Chinese female issues," and Chiang asked her to record her, and to the next phase of power. The fact that Mr. Wike held that Chiang had "bolshevized" (4) the Cultural Revolution. "In order to build a new society, Chiang said, "women must run the country," held leadership in her own right in a "very patriarchal society," surely did earn Chiang a sympathetic ear. Unfortunately, the wheels of bourgeois research and publishing grind very slowly. By the time-five years—the "wrecking window" was expanded to a 500-page book on what Professor Wike familizes as "a history of the revolution largely from Comrade Chiang Ch'ing's point of view" (p. 14), Chiang Ch'ing had been arrested, vilified as a "traitor," not to mention a "marginal." When the "Cultural Revolution" first unfolded in mid-1966 and catapulted Chiang front center stage, she seemed to have no historic past. Whether it was to right the record, or to invent an unwarranted high aloof in Chinese history, the truth is that the height of power was indeed, the culmination of the end for Chiang.

The first flurry of mid-Chiang posters appeared in 1972-74, when Mao was still alive and when rumors first surfaced about the biography she was recording via a bourgeois writer. Not one Mao inspired those attacks. He now claims that Mao saw through her "wrecking schemes" and warned her against her "section of four" in 1974.

A new period had begun at the 16th Congress of the Chinese Communist Party, when the undertow of revolt in the military following the downfall of Lin Piao culminated the rehabilitation of many of the former leaders.

Communist Party leaders who had been removed from their posts during the Cultural Revolution. Where Mao did it reluctantly, Chou hailed it as a sort of "reform" for the development of the national economy. Indeed, he raised Mao's main "enemies," Kang Huze and Ting Han, to Deputy Prime Minister. Mao could not have been more that insensible to Chiang in 1927-29. And 1926 proved it.

What was at stake was something greater than that an aborted alliance between, First, the National Congress, which drew up a whole new Constitution as well as both a five and a Twenty Year Plan for the development of the national economy. Mao did not always have his way, but he was never again the great occasion. Instead, he was meeting with every new reactionist in China, especially in China, as long as the Soviet leaders in Moscow, as long as he was regarded as "Kang Huze No. 1."

The year 1922 had revealed great unrest in China. There were many strikes, and also in Europe, China felt "surrounded." The Chinese came in the first spontaneous, genuine mass demonstration at the great Chou En-lai in April 1928. Instead of facing the reality that it was a spontaneous outburst against the regime -- the ruling "radicals" controlling the media -- that moved him, this time with the great aid of Chiang, to remove Tung, Hoa was to replace him. This was not an easy feat of Hu's, for Chou was not an easy feat of Hu's, for Chou was not easy to replace, and his supporters, his chairman, and the top party officials knew how to make the "in" position, and so organize the party of the party. Then, in 1929, he made the point that had been made before Mao died.

His manner was the same in 1927, in total control. The Chinese masses who were asked to produce more and to advance China to "normalize" the U.S. by the end of the next year. In his "interpretation" of the "Great Relationship,"
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---

NO SPOT ON the globe is free from getting sucked into the world market and its power politics. The latest little country, that literally has no wealth at all, over which imperialism could fight is Djibouti. Nevertheless, its achievement of independence disclosed not only the neighboring powers looking hungrily at it, but the Big Powers as well. Because it is a port, and thus a key to the Red Sea, one of the powers looking hungrily at it now, Ethiopia, has one of the two superpowers, Russia, on its side.

Poor Ethiopia. There is hardly any other country that is falling apart quite like it. Besides Eritrea fighting for its independence and Somalia claiming a good part of Ethiopia for its “Greater Somalia,” there are no less than five resistance movements within the country fighting the military regime. There is (near the second largest country on the African continent, with a fertile soil that used to be the envy of Africa, and the one and only country in Black Africa that was independent when the rest were colonies . . .

Yet with the 1960s initiating Black Revolution throughout Africa, the one that was not successful was in “independent” Ethiopia. And now the very military regime that overthrew Haile Selassie and has the opportunist aim to call itself “Marxist” is the very one to torment the old imperialist adventures against Eritrea and Somalia, as well as counter revolutions against the resistance movements of the Ethiopian masses. As it is disintegrating from all these battles within and without, in comes Russia (and of course Cuban “advisors”) despite the fact of Russia’s critical previous alliance with Somalia, where it already has naval and air base facilities at Berbera which are vital to the Indian Ocean’s strategic balance.

---

THE MIDDLE EAST has been and remains the main immediate point of crisis. But Russia has now lost not only in Egypt, and despite holding on tightly to the PLO and Syria, it is not overly secure in the Middle East; it is very much shaken up also in India; therefore any entrance to the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea is crucial to it. As if it wasn’t bad enough for a country calling itself Communist to participate in these myriad capitalist-imperialist double-thing, we also have the situation that while it’s certainly in the forefront in its anti-Zionist, anti-Israel anti-Sovietism, it is finding itself aiding Ethiopia as it is Israel.

One thing that happens not to have gotten much attention is that the Red Sea, which Saudi Arabia wants to make into an “Arab lake” while Ethiopia used to spend more revolutionary in its insistence that the Red Sea was in African “territory” and in any case was a world waterway, is that the Red Sea is also the outlet to the Port of Shab. Saudi Arabia is offering some very fancy gold to Djibouti to close its port to Ethiopia.

Now— as if all these points of crisis were not enough of a crazy quilt pattern of little power alliances, Big Power alliances, in the volatile Horn of Africa— enter China which is asking the U.S. to make sure to stop Russia’s power play in Africa, all while having both West and East, North and South, believe it is Taiwan that is the Israeli.

No, it is by no means a question of who the powers are the “wiser” and who is making the “fetal” mistake in the Horn, we can even whether there will be room for all tanks to travel through the Red Sea to the West, but who will finally get single global control in this state-capitalist age.

---

OUTSIDE OF THE theory of “protracted guerrilla war,” Mao’s most original theoretical-practical-philosophical-revolutionary contribution is the primacy of superstructure over economic base, ideology over the relations at the point of production which he called “production.” Culture itself being ordered to shed its life and form “proletarian.”

Mao “died” at the moment he “signed” Lin Piao’s
...death warrant, and rolled out the red carpet for Nixon. It is from this moment that the question of a triangular world, a possible alignment with U.S. imperialism, was placed on the historic agenda... China can challenge the bi-polar world not simply because it has 500 million people, but because it also has the hydrogen bomb and can become an important industrial power. Which is why it was “necessary” for Japan to die, and with him, the illusions of the Little Red Book.

It may still happen that it will be the Middle East, now that Likud’s reactionary victory has brought Menachem Begin to power and thus further heated up that volatile region, that will be the first to detonate war. But what will be the outcome? Humanity’s very survival is the tri-polar struggle for social world domination. Which is why we are happening in China remains so pivotal.

* * *

BECAUSE THE CRISIS is so total and revolt so continuous, it no sooner stops in one place, be it China or Paris, May 1968, or Portugal, 1975 — when it arises in Soweto. This year it is not only South Africa but what seems to have no direct connection with it — the Blackout in New York — which disclosed the once intercontinental character of the Black Dimension. Which is why so simple a matter as an accidental blackout in New York noted as anyone of the Achilles heel of capitalist, its real — the imperial carrier of poverty to the blacks in America as in Africa.

It is by no accident that what we plan for next year on the Black struggle in the U.S., in Africa, in Latin America, especially the Caribbean; is seen in the very title of our projected pamphlet: Frantz Fanon, Soweto, and American Black Thought, for we cannot forget that Frantz Fanon was neither African nor Americans, but West Indians...

It is because there is a totality of mind, body, and heart in the spontaneous movement of masses from force to reason, that, from the start of the American enslavement of the Blacks, the triangular trade of slaves, molasses and sugar from Africa, to Latin America, to the U.S., became the triangular exchanges of aspirations for freedom on every subject from nationalism to culture to new human relations... At this moment, nothing short of the totality of transformation of all human relations can act as banner. It is to that end that our Black Thought pamphlet aims.

* * *

BUT THIS IS NOT the place to spell out the concrete activities, especially the expansion of News & Letters. What you see before you in the bound volumes of N&L for seven long years gives you some view of the world none other gives you. The point is now to become not just a reader as we expand but writer-wielders yourselves. Let your voices be heard, and your thoughts and your labor. Again, just as you will get an Organization Report, you will have a N&L report, and Youth and Women’s Liberation will follow.

I am mentioning them in passing only to stress that the politicalization began with the Political Philosophy Letters will first now be extended in the way in which we function in the movement, in other organizations, and in our organizational: political - political - membership growth as the warp and woof of philosophy in action — and action as the remaking of the world, beginning with preparations for the American Revolution, not because we are under the illusion that we are now in a pre-revolutionary situation but because we know that the totality of the capitalist crisis is such that for them time is running out. For us it has just begun.
Gramsci's 'philosophy of praxis'
adds up to fear, on the one hand of philosophy and on the other of protestant revolution, thus reducing the prospect to robot. it therefore is essential, though in very abbreviated form, to present the definitions of Gramsci’s “philosophy of praxis.” Indeed, the very phrase itself shows how inexpressible are thoughts from action, theory from practice, philosophy from revolution, and so on. the central point is that one cannot moving away from the central core of Gramsci—“philosophy of praxis”—on the ground that since the fascist prison guards were looking over his shoulder, and since any a time when Gramsci would have used the word revolution he has to use the phrase “philosophy of praxis” both for Marx and for revolution, as if that were not true. (4) Quite the contrary. First and foremost, the phrase of “praxis“ is directly on philosophy. Far from adhering to a “Cronusian” ideal of an Hegel, his most profound and violent attack is precisely on this aspect of “historicism.” This “Cronusian” ideal historical-ism is a degenerated and mutilated idealism that no longer is a fundamental concern is the panicky fear of Jacobin movements of every active intervention of the great and powerful masses as historically progressive factors.” (4)

SPONTANEITY

To Gramsci, “history” was always in motion shaping history. So much so, that it is not only the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois interpretations he attacked, but also Marxist, from Plehanov to Bukharin, because their methodological and scientific views had no conception of what Lenin called “the dialectic proper,” whose central Marxist core was the proletarians subject transforming history. To politically imprisoned in Berlin, Stepanov’s vision was Gramsci’s whole life, that his “merely” inspirational writings before he became a leader of the Communist Party of Italy — grappling with the Berlin Duma period — early Gramsci’s vision permeated with the dialectic of thought, as well as of liberation. That is first and foremost is not at all an accidental sign of his philosophical vision which kept him from activism. In truth, the first five years Gramsci created ways to send out uncensored messages, or was able to talk in person to visitors, there was no idea of separation between philosophy and revolution.

Indeed, this is when efforts to attack the designations as “insurrectionalist” and “spontaneous” in addition to attacking them in Gramsci’s concept of “Council Communism” and the Marxo-Syndicalist concept. It is this which led the Stalinist-Communist leader, Trotsky, not to publish Gramsci’s Prison Notebooks for ten long years, and then to truncate them in the post-war years as the Communist became part of the bourgeois government and capitulated to the Catholic Church. The subtraction, however, that the writings are being written as written, it has no more stopped the present-day Communists from perpetrating this revolutionary’s “philosophy of praxis” than did the truncated version which had likewise failed. Roosevelt’s downfall as a result of his own failure and reality for our age.

What is of the essence for our age, which has witnessed more abortive revolutions than any, is Gramsci’s reminder that a philosophy is no longer to create ground for working out a new, urgent need for revolutionary act on our age. For this it is necessary to turn to the most fundamental of all God’s names — what, he called “absolute historicism,” “absolute humanism.”

ABSOLUTE ‘HISTORICISM’, ABSOLUTE HUMANISM

Nothing so scorns economism, even when they are Marxists, as the word “absolute,” as if it really could mean only God or something equally mythical they attribute to Hegel. Because of this, even when they wish to restore to Gramsci his revolutionary stature the greatest part of the time is spent endlessly revealing the Stalinist distortions, while they themselves still drain philosophy out of Marxist economic categories as to turn Marx himself into an “economist.” In a word, what bothers them most of Gramsci is “lack of economism.” (5) It must have been kept such vital marxism that Gramsci had in mind when he wrote it has been forgotten that in the case of a very common expression (historical materialism) one should put the accent on the first term "historical" — and not on the second which is of metonymical origin, the fundamental concern is the panicky fear of Jacobin movements of every active intervention of the great and powerful masses as historically progressive factors.” (4)

On this, the fifty-first year since the arrest of Gramsci, with which the fascists thought they would prevent this from happening, let us return to the study of Gramsci’s own writings, not just as “history” and not unhistorically but as ground to build anew, both in its integrity transforming theory and revolution, and to work out anew a relationship of theory to practice. To the symbolic reality of class struggle, our organization can first come alive in a successful revolution. (2)

The French edition of the truncated version of Gramsci’s writings is profoundly endorsed by the French edition of “Gramsci and Historical Materialism.” It gives both a more comprehensive view, though abbreviated, of the whole literature, as well as a critique of the French version, its misinterpreting. It appears in Telos, Spring 1977, which also contains the other articles as well as reviews of the available translations in English.


(2) See Chris Harman’s two-part spread in International Revolution, 1967, which, though it tells us less than is available to Harman’s economic distortions, ends with an economic summarization which totally disregards Gramsci’s philosophical totality. Although he provides a correct abstract account of the relation between economics and politics, Gramsci is alien to the great Marxians in not integrating a concrete economic dimension into his political writings. This is an arbitrary and . . . To be that distant from Gramsci’s working out the concept of totality is to be deserving of all Gramsci wrote against Bakhtin’s economic distortions of the dialectic proper.” See my analysis of other KS disdain for philosophy: “From Cliff to Trotsky” in The Communist. (3) Prison Notebooks, p. 403.

(4) Part of the Prison Notebooks were incorporated into The Modern Princes and other writings, London, N.V., 1977. It is from there that I quote here pp. 106-107. It is the central article for our purposes, which Gramsci called “Critical Notes on an Attempt at a Popular Prerogation of Marxian by Bakhtin.” pp. 83-17.
WOMAN AS REASON

Nearly 20,000 women converged on Houston, Texas, for the IWY Conference Nov. 1977. Since delegates to the government-sponsored and-funded affair numbered only 2,000, it is clear that the activist observers, who had to pay their own way, felt that just being there could help transform the meeting into an event that would change the face of the United States on the question of women’s liberation. They were right. They created a momentum far beyond the “National Plan of Action” devised by the appointed commissioners.

Despite the fact that the well-organized, efficiently-run conference had worked to have all 28 resolutions of the Plan voted as presented, the disabled, the minoritized, and the then older women were explicitly new arenas for themselves that gave far more consciousness to women’s rights than the abstract cornerstone of the entire convention: the ERA.

STYLE, SUBSTANCE AND SWEEP

It was the Substitute Resolution on Minority Women that was the high point of the conference in everything from style to substance to comprehensiveness. Five women presented it. The Black woman who rushed to the mike to offer the substitute yielded to the Asian woman, who spoke and then yielded to the Hispanic woman, who spoke and then yielded to Coretta King, who completed it. The Native American spoke of her children who were taken away; the Hispanic of the deportation struggle and the question of bilingual study; the Asian woman of sweatshop working conditions; and Coretta King of their demand for firm government support for affirmative action. No wonder she said, not on how much was achieved those past 10 years, but by declaring that “We will have a long way to go.”

As in the new substitute resolutions that were passed so recently, it was clear that it was not what was done there at the conference that was the most important, but what remains to be done afterward. That task was recognized as the one to be done by themselves, not left to those “above.” It was the recognition of Self as social being, Liberation in action.

The euphoria generated by the massive attendance, the fact that the delegates were as well organized as they were, the enthusiasm with which the KKK did not happen, and the need for and achievement of the resolutions, that the new context of the present age, the new context of thehearers, so that a person like Blasina Carter, who came as “personal emissary of the President,” was never challenged on his backward move refusing federal funds for the poor needing abortion.

COUNTER-REVOLUTION’S WHIP

The anti-Women Liberationists held their own counter-meeting of some 10,000 men and women, from around Texas and Utah mainly—especially male-dominated in its counter-revolutionary philosophy of unfreedom, as represented by the KKK, Divorce, Conservative Union, as well as the most right-wing members of the Catholic Church.

and Mormon Churches. But the presence of the counter-revolution was felt within the IWY hall, too. What made chauvinists think that a whale was needed to try to keep the rightwing women delegates in line to vote against every and all resolutions?

Unfortunately, the majority delegates—mainly white, middle-class, career women, aiming for political jobs and running for electoral office—weere too anxious that all behave as “leaders” that they would not entertain a motion to expel the Mississippi delegation, though it included KKKers. Actions like that only hold back the confrontation of ideas, but permitted the conclusion that the counter-revolution was not a threat. None bothered to mention that police cars with KKK insignias patrolled the streets surrounding the conference and struck terror among lesbians, nor that the other “rally” referred to the IWY as “International Witches’ Year”.

On the other hand, it was the total of the counter-revolution that did mobilize the conference, and brought a leader like Betty Friedan, who had been feeling the lesbian question, and broken her mind and urge adoption of the motion not only for “reproductive freedom” (the right to abortion on demand), but also the right of “sexual preference” (homosexuality), both motions passed overwhelmingly.

When one of the revolutionary said that the conference was dominated by “lesbian chauvinists,” one feminist writer, Lucy Komisar, smiled, “Well, they can’t be both, can they?” The significance of this incident isn’t the “sense of humor” that New York Times reporter emphasized, but the seriousness of the activism of ages—literally from 16 to 60, the connection with history’s path, not because the Smithsonian Institute built them, or the gavel Susan B. Anthony had used in 1890, but because her niece-namabdike, 61, was there—and because the young women who had never heard of either one were the ones who were carrying the struggle far beyond that was at the end of the 19th century.

That is what brings us to the question of the left and the ideological battles that, unfortunately, didn’t take place.

WOMAN AS REASON AND REVOLUTIONARY

At the 1975 IWY international conference in Mexico City, many of the delegate wives of state rulers, parroting the political line of their respective husband-rulers, whether that be Mrs. Sadat or Mrs. Rhab. Unlike them, these middle-class white women were moved by the continental questions and by the minority and other women to neither stick only to their own 25 resolutions, nor be so totally silent as not to hear some of their voices from below. They knew these voices had no intention of remaining silent even if the conference was adjourned and legislation tried to take over and stall and stall and stall.

The sad part, then, was that the left itself would try either to limit itself to single issues like ERA or right to abortion or action against deportation or to think of themselves as “grass roots” rather than re-enacting the actual grass roots whose consciousness was the one for a battle of ideas.

Women’s Liberation News & Letters Committee did raise the question of Woman as Reason. The many in which Iranian women showed their interest in Marxism and Freedom, and Black women their interest in a pamphlet like Sistren, Politics and Revolution in Mao’s China, saying, “Sistren is everywhere,” showed the universality and intercommensurability of rights with revolution.

The counter-revolution, with their shudders against the very subject of the conference, did change the questions from any single issue to the totality of revolution. That unholds an entirely new banner: Woman as Reason and as Revolutionary. Nothing short will help uproot this exploitative, sexist society.
State-plan fetishism and George Novack's philosophy.

DECEMBER, 1977

by Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION

and Marxism and Freedom

The Trotskyite silence on the direct Stalinist revision of Marx's Capital remains unbroken ever since it was first announced by the Stalinist theoreticians in 1924. When their newly revised and corrected works are in the 1970s from rapidly aproaching dual roles. As a Stalinist political economist, Ernest Mandel argues to introduce the new English edition of Marx's greatest work, not just for sowing doubt on those revisions, but by actually glorifying their codification as a "genuine rebirth of Marxism!" (1) As a Marxist philosopher, George Novack pontificates on dialectics as if that was hardly more than "the logic of motion, not of rest." (2)

That simplification would hardly merit a polemic were it not for the fact that the politics of George Novack's philosophy, as of Mandel's economics, add up to one more whitewash of the Russian theory and practice of state-capitalism. What unites Mandel and Novack, and their philosophy and economics, is, of course, the fetishism of the plan. Listen to Novack. In the midst of his exegesis of Lucio Colletti's "return" to Kautskyism, explaining the Marxist concept of fetishism: "(The fetishism of commodities) flows from the unalterable de-centrally, unplanned character of the capitalist economy." (p. 1207)

MARX, OF COURSE, said the exact opposite. First, he warned against following "the manner copied by Froebel from bourgeois economics, which looks upon this matter as though a society with a capitalist mode of production would lose its specific historical and economic characteristics by being taken as a unity. Not at all. We have in this case to deal with the aggregate capitalist." (2) Above all, Marx never warned of speaking against the "groping spirit of capital," so inherent in the factory production line that he called it "the strictly regulating authority of the social mechanism of the labor process graduated into a simple hierarchy." (3)

On the other hand, listen how Novack, in 1977, expands his ideas of what is needed against what he calls "unplanned character of capitalist economy": "Whereas the ruling bureaucratic caste and its regime is necessary, the rationalized and planned economy which is mismanaged, is highly progressive . . . " (p. 1206) And as if that didn't sufficiently hide the elementary nature of the Russian economy, Novack calls that state-capitalist economy with his Chicago compas a "society of transition from capitalism to socialism!"

WAS THIS REALLY 1977, I thought? Want's that exactly what he said way back in 1951, in answer to the denunciation of the state-capitalist economy (then called Johnson-Forsy), entitled State-Capitalism and World

(1) Mandel's phrase appears both in his magnum opus, Mandel Evgenievskaya Theory, and in his introduction to the Penguin edition of Marx's Capital. See also my review of this work in News & Letters, May and June-July, 1979, and N&L pamphlet coming out in the form in both England and the U.S., Marx's Capital and Today's Global Crisis.

(2) George Novack, "Back to Kautsky: The Retreat of Lucio Colletti," in Intercontinental Press (11/14 and 11/21/77) p. 1206. The other pagination refers to these articles.


Revolution! Here, in part, is the reply I handed in then: (5)

"Comrades Ward and Wright stand everything on its base. Where Marx says the property relationship is nothing but a legal expression for the production relationship, they make the productive relationship nothing but an expression of the property form or relationship. Where Marx says that outside the production relationship, property is nothing but a juridical illusion, Comrades Ward and Wright say: 'Production relations of the economy transitional to socialism are contained in the productive process': It sounds like what Novack has just written in the latest issue of Intercontinental Press. He speaks interchangeably, in fact of all the objective and subjective developments these past 15 years. All that has changed is the person singled out for criticism -- Lucio Colletti, former CP, present SP, always the bourgeois academic. It is always easier to argue with a Social Democrat, rather than a revolutionary Marxist."

Indeed, as I wrote in 1951: "Even where Comrades Ward and Wright state a simple Marxist truth, it somehow gets transformed into its opposite. They state, for instance, that the real contradiction is between productive forces and production relations. Absolutely true. But where Marx includes the revolutionary potential of the greatest productive forces, the productive forces with them are only the simple material means of production. No wonder that the 'quest for universality' is to them 'an ideological, not a material force.' No wonder they do not appeal the world to the world, as is necessary for an understanding of the materialist method." (6)

My article, "The Revolt of the Workers and the Plan of the Intellectuals (An answer to Comrades W. Ward and J. G. Wright)" is on microfilm in the Raya Dunayevskaya Collection at Wayne State University Labor History Archives, Detroit. Novack wrote that under the name of W. Ward. J. G. Wright, is deceased.
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that, though they quote from Marx's Poverty of Philosophy as often, they failed to grasp its essence: "But from the moment that all special developed causes, the need for universality, the tendency towards an integral development of the individual begins to make itself felt" (p. 123)."

THIS IS EXACTLY what Novak cannot see — the proletarian at the creative shaper of history, uprooting capitalism, private and state. As I wrote in 1951: "Comrades Ward and Wright accuse ‘Johnson-Forest’ of the heinous crime of identifying the capitalist economy with the Soviet economy. They mean the economy of Stalinist Russia, which, since 1941-44, the Stalinist theoreticians themselves have admitted operates according to the law of value." Since that has always, by foe and friend alike, been considered the characteristic law of capitalism, I asked:

"Why the silence on the Stalinist revisionists? Comrade Trotsky marked out a close division between the bureaucratic, which, he said, would not defend state property, on the one hand, and the mass — who would defend it, on the other hand. . . . Since the death of Trotsky, the Stalinist counter-revolution has come to full theoretical bloom in the revision of Marx's greatest work:

"(1) The Stalinists have affirmed that the law of value was applicable to all societies. That they separated what Marx unites: the law of value from the law of surplus value which it entailed."

"(2) They ordered that Chapter I of 'Volume I of Capital' be omitted from its study. While they have thus utilized its dialectic structure.

"(3) They have substituted for the law of the decline in the rate of profit as the law of capitalist collapse, the averaging out of the rate of profit as the law of capitalism."

"There is no secret about this wholesale corruption of Marxist political economy. . . . What has the Fourth International had to say about all this? Not a word."

THAT WAS WRITTEN June 5, 1951. During the IS and a half years that have elapsed, not only has the American Trotskyite silence on these Stalinist revisions not been broken, but the European theoretician has, as we showed, glorified the whole revision as a "rebirth of Marxism." Suchcontinue larding Russian theoreticians in economics and philosophy.

"The theoretical axis of Marx's Capital," as was stated in 1951, "is the question of plan — the plan of the capitalist against the freely associated workers. Chapter Xill, in particular, is unmistakable in its dialectic opposition between the despotic plan inherent in capital and the plan of the proletariat in the cooperative labor process. The cooperative form of the labor process unclashed a new productive power. The attempt to control this power within capitalism confines is the base of the despotic plan of capital. Marx affirms that there can no longer be any doubt about this. The workers' revolution has disclosed that what appeared ideally as plan was in practice the undisputed authority of the capitalist."

As against this, Marx continued to pose the workers' resistance at the point of production, in the cooperative labor process in opposition to the intellectual planners who could not comprehend this new power. We must repeat: future generations will stand in amazement at the equivocal but relentless resistance the Fourth International carries on against this.
Shifting alliances in the Middle East

by Raya Dunayevskaya

National Chairmanwoman, News & Letters Committee

The two months that have elapsed since Sadat’s spectacular peace trip to Jerusalem on Nov. 9 saw it all very nearly collapse in Ismalla Dec. 28. There the机能 of a possible new stage for Middle East relations. Sadat, and the guest super-hawk, Israeli Prime Minister Begin, far from coming out with a joint statement of agreement, produced an expression of irreconcilable positions, all couched in diplomatic but unmistakable language. Two days later Begin expelled the ethnocrats “Palestinian authorities” in “defiance” and “self-rule” in language that brought approval from his Kemalist counterparts, however, could not but read these 24 points as but one non-negotiable imperialist point: continued military occupation of the West Bank of Jordan (which began in 1967 in calling Joda and Samara) and the Egyptian Gaza Strip.

We must now modify the expression, “all others” to read “all others except President Carter.” He managed to find “self-rule” under Israeli guns “feasible”! Whereupon President Sadat must have burned up the private line to the White House. What he publicly declared “made any job more difficult” must have been concerted more precisely on the private line, sufficiently shaking up Carter’s scheduled six-nation six-day whirlwind tour to make home for one uns’-doted step at Aswan. It is this that became the focal point of the whole, not only the Middle East whole, but globally, from India to France.

Just as the question of Palestine was raised at the very start of the trip in Poland, and just as when Schmidt was found hawking in the shadows in Egypt, he did King Hussein in Iran and elsewhere, so Sadat Arabia held the reins to world oil while Carter ended the trip bequeathing NAYO, for reconvening worldwide, with very different and unequal weapons, it is true, but the same exploitative class goals. When Carter opened home stood on Jan. 6 he declared Sadat to be “one of the most prominent and one of the most indef i nitely in favor of another ethnocrat — “principles” — and that which would have been little positions of war, even in Scoundrel while U.S. imperialism makes the final decision.

Carter gets away with his back-vokers past, especially the Yom Kippur war he launched in 1973, Sadat made sure that Begin knew he is no more relevant than. That the very day of the Israeli invasion when both leaders still smiled, Mandafta, editor of Anbar al-Foul, wrote: “The meetings in Ismalla were not with delegates of the state of Israel, but with a fellow Jew... Jewish society creating his own flash.”

JOINT U.S.-RUSSIAN STATEMENT AND CARTER’S ZIOLOGIE

No, it wasn’t courage or any other psychological characteristic that brought both hawks together — for peace. For this is the one thing that it was the characteristic of both hawks and extreme Right-wingers that enabled them to open this decade with their spectacular visit to China, in all cases. It is the power, not the “general” which a general in the event of Khrushchev it was the Vietnamese war that the U.S. was losing, not only on the battlefield, but at home. In the case of the Middle East now, it is that these super-hawks in separate lands reached a sudden concrescence, on the part of the hawks, when confronted with the shock of a joint Russian-American statement in the midst of the “peace situation in the Middle East” to declare that “the only right and effective way” to achieve a “solution” is to conduct a Geneva Peace Conference “not later than December, 1977.”

Israel and Egypt were not the only ones surprised by this October 1 joint statement by the two super-powers. More surprised still, but in this case pleasantly, was the PLO’s Arabi, interpreting the statement’s reference to “the legitimate rights of the Palestinians” on as independent Palestinian state, Arabi left it be known that this statement could indeed serve as a “foundation” for talking.

After all, this had been preceded by more than six months of signifying by President Carter. Ever since March he had moved from stressing “defensible borders” for Israel to publicly endorsing the concept of a “Palestinian homeland” in his Mar. 10 Clinton, Mass. speech. By summer he had let it drift down to the PLO that, if UN Resolution 242 were accepted, a “Palestinian entity could indeed be considered. And whereas Vice-President Mondale was, in June 28, and to San Francisco to solemnly pronounced the new thing in the Arab side by using U.S. had “no plan, no timetable, no map” to try to impose settlement, no doubt was left in anyone’s mind that there was, indeed, a new change in the Arab side. The type of change, however, that landed U.S. with a joint statement was enough not only to get Israel and American Zionists to begin pressuring Carter, but sent fear into “moderate Arabs” who are often all perfectionists.

It is at this point that Sadat decided to act on his own. But not so alone that it didn’t meet with some concurrence of Begin. Why didn’t Begin act in June? Begin’s concurrence was undertaken too far behind from U.S. President’s demand. Now that they know that the U.S. will have no part of little powers settling the time line for any new overthrow of power that may face them, that the U.S. has to unite with its global enemies, Russia, they, in turn, promptly referred to the United States as if, in this case, Egypt, and takes a leadership for a new approach of Middle East relations.

No doubt, U.S. imperialism’s role will be the decisive factor, whatever what has been that is now found yet another euphemism — “principles” — to arrive at a “solution,” or whatever all comes to naught once and again. But the so-called Left hardly helps matters by automatically siding with the “radical” Arabs, no matter where that leads them. Therefore it falls into the trap of all rulers, as if the 20 years from 1948 to 1978 were all unresolved development. The truth is very different, and truth is always contradictory of being.

Everyone, from the rulers — both Israel and Arab — to the Left, Trotskyists especially (now that Trotsky is dead, and been dead of another 37 years), likes to pontificate about 30 years of endless Middle East wars, as if every one of these was one and the same, with “Zionist imperialism” on the one side, and “Arab revolutions” on the other.

The truth, however, is that the first Arab war against the state of Israel was still going on except for its independence was anything but revolutionary. It is upon this revolutionary moment of all feudal Arab states was the mid-decade feature. It is not true that made the kings and emirs “revolutionary.” Nasser, for example, approvingly quotes to his Egyptian Liberation, The
Philosophy of Revolution, Erich A. Cohen’s report of what the Egyptians talked about in the armistice talks: “The object of the Egyptian statesman was to establish a national state in the draw to recognize the state of Isreal, to deal with the United States...”

And an anti-Semite, a state capitalist ruler as Stalin was the first to set up the United States to the draw to recognize the state of Isreal. It did not be the United States to any of those settlements. Rather, it was because, until then, no Jewish state was established in the Jewish state that it has collaborated with the United States. Stalin fought the Nazis, but brought a dimension other than oil in the Middle East.

Finally, and most important, there were many revolutionaries in Palestine who opposed the creation of an Arab Jewish state, hoping and fighting for a bi-national state free of imperialism. These, too, had to face the reality that the Arabs were as opposed to collaboration with them as the Zionists, and the Arab states were all the same. By putting just on Trotsky (or he was certainly no Zionist) but a revolutionary opponent of Stalin stressed that the rise of Stalin compelled a new look at the “Jewish Question,” or Marxist revolutionaries in Palestine in 1948 had to confront the reality of an independent state, and therefore work for revolutionary goals of uprooting the capitalist state within its own borders. More than hard work, it had to work within their homelands for a new classless society. Rather than make anti-Israeli the unifying cement, social revolution had to become the driving force.

Russia didn’t change its mind as to which side it was on until 1955 when Khrushchev concluded his arms deal with Egypt—Nasser’s Egypt, that had observed King Farouk. This was Russia’s first break-through into the Middle East. What does that mean? Russia was always on the “revolutionary” side. The very next year, the 1956 war was a very different matter than the 1948 war. Though triggered by Nasser’s nationalization of the Suez Canal and Dulles’ arrogance refused to help build the Aswan Dam, the point is that Eisenhower’s imperial USA had to oppose it as an end to old-style British-French illusions that they were still global powers. It is true that there was all too little to be used by France and Great Britain how dominated by Nasserist Egypt. But Eisenhower was so impressed that Great Britain and France still fancied themselves imperial powers that he stopped that war and made Israel return to its 1948 borders.

Revolutionary Arab nationalism did emerge in the 1960s. But there were also very contradictory births, as witnessed Al Fatah and Fatah that had their origins in fascism as much as in revolutionary nationalism. In any case, the unifying cement for Israelis-Arab war was not revolution, but simply and purely anti-Israel. And, along with the goal of “driving Israel into the sea” came uncritical alliance with Russia. Which, in turn, convinced U.S. imperialism that it had the “new enemy” — Israel — in the Middle East against its global enemy, Russia. That is no longer true. And though the U.S. toned heavily toward Israel in the 1967 war, that hasn’t been the case ever since 1972.

For the Left to act as if the disparate Arab states are all “one Arab nation” and, even when theable, are playing a “revolutionary role” while equating Zionism with South African racism, is no less false than President Carter’s declaration for “human rights” when he sent Bush keeping men in Iran. But history teaches us the entry of Saudi Arabia “black gold” in the 1973 war, and more crucial, it blinks-in to the tragedy of Lebanon, and the PLO, 1978-80. It is seen these two historic-turning points we must now focus to fully comprehend what is the “new” which is just shifting of the cards in global alignments and realignments, and that which is the kind of “revolution” which could have meant the fate of social revolutions.

ENTER SAUDI ARABIA’S BLACK GOLD

The first slight U.S. tilting toward the Arab side in the Yom Kippur war in 1973 had little to do with Egypt’s surprise attack which caught arrogant Israeli off balance, and gained Egypt a sort of victory. Rather it was Saudi Arabia’s use of oil as a political weapon which shook up the whole international world system as well as Europe and the United States—as to come to the total ideological disarray. The Gulf War could so easily come in both to the belittling of Israel and the constraining of all oil-enclaves U.S. imperialism likewise go without-explaining trying to hold on to its illusion of the 20th century as “the American century.”

Overwhelming the myriad political crises came the global economic crisis, the daily plunging the world into a “double-depression” It is this deep recession that still underscores the current situation with Saudi Arabia, instead of shaking up the international capitalist world, is working hand in hand with U.S. imperialism. Carter’s signaling was preceded by Henry Kissinger’s imperial arrogance, first, in threatening the oil kingdoms with invasion, then declaring “the War of Europe,” not to mention raising China to superpower status and thus transforming, by fiat, the bipolar state-
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capitalist world into a bipolar one—rather than the "tri-

lateral" one Arentzah was mapping out for Carter, which holds up the notion that the United States

and the"West Europe—Japan was the world.

Plans by Israel in and out of power have a way of getting, however, of being totally undermined by elemental social revolutions. The mid-1970's, instead of stemming under the might of the world, saw revolutions erupt from Portugal to Angola, and directly in the Middle East, specifically Lebanon. The US Revolution in Lebanon, AND THE OLD IN THE PLO, 1975-6

This is not the place to go into detail on the situ-

ation in Lebanon which sparked a mass revolution, a genuine social revolution against its rulers, Christian and Moslem alike. It is close enough to our times so that we remember that it had been brewing for a long time along class lines, and when it finally erupted, sparked also by the neo-Nazi Christian Right maneuvers of Palestinians returning from a Resettlement Front meet-

ing, the Palestinians worked as one with the Lebanese revolutionaries.

Because of the Palestinian provocation with Israel as Enemy No. 1, however, and the PLO playing political games in the UN to get the Resolution equating Zionism to South African racism passed, the resolution in Lebanon was totally subordinated to anti-Israel.

Soon we were witness to a replay of the 1970-71 slaughter of Palestinians by King Hussein of Jordan on a more gigantic scale—which this time helped also destroy the Lebanese revolution. The extremely con-

trary role of the PLO in Lebanon's civil war was stretched from being one with the native Lebanese Left against the exploitative capitalist system to the near-

counter-revolutionary role of welcoming Syria's interven-

tion, without in any way revealing the intra-Arab nationalisms between Jordan and Syria. In the Jewish

parade of allusions such as class lines and sans any mention of the history of the revolution not defeated.

To have the Left forget all this and once again turn their backs on the enemy is to show the new con-

ditions created by Sada's trip to Jerusalem to a failure that would once again chase all doors to new revolutions in the Middle East.

BEGIN'S NEW UNDERMININGS

Begin has no need of the "Left" to re-

create the atmosphere which would make anti-Israel the prevailing current for the whole Arab world, no matter how divided it is at the moment. He has been master of that political life, from his time as the young leader of the pre-state underground days to idiosyncratically not returning even when Israel became a state. And just as he was to do in the Knesset, he now has a recent from the end-step forward made when he returned to Israel not as a day hero but as a man without proof of his referendum nature.

First he played out in the Knesset and made public the 20-point so-called peace proposition which must have reminded every school child of Jewish times when Pius XIX ruled Palestine. Then, as if that reaffirmation of continued military occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip was not militaristic enough, suddenly the United States in the Danial began signing up

ground for new occupying settlements. Thirdly, he found his own type rhetorical thunder to yell threats, that if Israeli military presence were not guaranteed in the Gaza, he would walk out of further "negotiations."

Whether the United States can find yet another euphemism to rush him in need be no concern of revolu-

tionaries. After all, the liberal-sounding line, "the cold war is over," has been current in the Administration only as a way of declaring that "coexistence" with Russia is no longer to be the overwhelming fact of all global relations. At the same time, there is no reason to think that the other nuclear ultra, Russia, will let itself be shut out quite as unaccustomedly as Carter did when he casually forgets the joint US-Soviet statement in order to embrace Sadat's initiative. Why should any revolutionaries be interested in the double crosses and horse-trading that go on among rulers before they decide to plunge us into yet another war? Even these questions for single world power have to be asked since it would be a nuclear war and would put an end to civilization as we have known it. No, what we need is to do as was done to Marxists: fundamentals—a philosophy of liberation that would give direction its direction.

WHERE ARE THE VOICES OF THE MASSES?

First, let us not forget what sort Sadat is to Israel.

It was not the economic crisis Egypt is in. It was the

re严峻ness of the masses. 1979 has been filled with mass opposition to the capitalist rule, from a general strike, to a veritable mass uprising against the price hikes.

Sada's had to retreat when not only was the mass anger unmistakable, but it was clear that the Egyptian masses would no longer tolerate, along with their horrible con-

ditions of labor, being saddled with impossible inflation.

In a word, it was fear of social revolution that made him as cautious as to break with the worst lines for diversion of the masses from their dissatisfaction with conditions of life and labor by peace negotiations.

Secondly, Begin's new turn—once again turn to Israel as the enemy is to show the new con-

ditions created by Sada's trip to Jerusalem to a failure that would once again close all doors to new revolutions in the Middle East.

Jan. 5, 1975
Rosdolsky's methodology and Lange's revisionism

Among non-Stalinist but leadership-conscious Marxists there is hardly a work that has gained the acclaim accorded to The Making of Marx's CAPITAL BY Roman Rosdolsky, published in Great Britain in 1966. It has now been brought out by Pluto Press in an English translation for the first time, as if the period itself testifies to its importance. If not a "classic", it is, after all, about the only available lengthy, serious commentary on Marx's Grundrisse, which has only recently been published in English for the first time.

Roman Rosdolsky, a well-known Marxist theoretician, tells us that ever since 1949, when he obtained one of the rare copies of the Grundrisse then available, he has been studying the "Rough Draft" of Capital and set himself a two-fold task: (1) to write a commentary, or more precisely, an exposition of the new discovery "made in Marx's own words"; and (2) "to make a scientific evaluation of some of the new findings which it contained" (p. xi). The preoccupation with the latter comprises Roman Rosdolsky's original contribution. To it he devotes Parts One and Seven—"Introduction", i.e., mainly the origin and structure of the work; and "Critical Exercise". To these 225 pages should really be added some 36 pages (Part Six, "Conclusion") which summarize what he found in the exposition and commentary of the work. Since, as he correctly notes, "Of all the problems in Marx's economic theory the most neglected has been that of his method both in general and, specifically, in relation to Hegel", methodology is the underlying motif not only of his "critical exercises", but the reason for writing the whole of the 581 pages.

I wish I could report that a genuine contribution to dialectical methodology had been made by Rosdolsky. Unfortunately, nothing could be further from the truth. If there is anything that is totally missing in his massive study, it is a dialectical reading of his own material. What he does make is a contribution to the comprehension of the Grundrisse (lots of quotations, especially on Money, but no self-movement of the whole--the reader gets neither a view of the historical sweep of Marx's concept of what the whole work was to be, nor an understanding of why Marx nevertheless decided to start everything "new").

THE MISSING DIALECTIC

This is said not to play down the significance of the Grundrisse, much less to suggest no contribution at all. The "starting point" meant Marx discarded the validity of the range of the "Rough Outline" just because, instead of the six books there listed, Marx resold for publication only three, and finished only one. Quite the contrary. While he definitely rejected its shapelessness, comparing it to the formlessness of "superfluous cartars", Marx meant to develop further some of the most brilliant and profound of his writings that could not find their way into the new dialectic structure of Capital, Volume I—like "The Preface to Critique of Hegelian Philosophy and Revolutions", also for changes in the structure of Capital, and also for the Grundrisse and Today's Global Credit, especially sections entitled "The Relationship of History to the Economy", pp. 15-29, and "Apportionment and Reality", pp. 77-82.

Capitalist Economic Forms", and the "absolute movement of becoming". We get a weld of this in a footnote in the totally raw "New Edition" of Capital to refer to the Taiping Revolution, as against the quietest European workers labor. Or, more precisely, the European revolutionaries. In this period he was writing in follows the 1940 Chinese Revolution, which was the propaganda for the European Marxists to publish, first, that very section; and final the whole of the Grundrisse. (The English translation, however, first came out in 1972.)

It was the specific section on the economic forms preceding capitalist production that became most relevant to the new birth of a "Third World". Nor was it only a question of relevance. It was the dialectics of liberalism that gave the dialectic a new dimension of revolution. It is the dialectic that is missing from Rosdolsky's methodology. By using it unconsciously with methodology he has managed to reduce both to mere presupposition.

THE PRESUPPOSITION

Let's take a second look at Rosdolsky's claim for presupposition with methodology. It has led him, among other things, to create a special Appendix directly to Part One on Rosa Luxemburg's Accumulation of Capital rather than wait for the end of his work where he deals with all debates on Volume II of Capital. (Conversely, Luxemburg's critique of Marx's theory of accumulation looks 1965.) What he does make is "Methodological Comments on Rosa Luxemburg's Critique of Marx's Schemes of Production" (pages 63-72) turns out to be a question of his presupposition of a "closed capitalist society".

Luxemburg was much more than the word, dialectic, nor methodology, making it clear that she is arguing against Marx's "theoretical assumption of a society of capitalists and workers only", and against the dialectical development from this. It is the assumption, that she claims, is "the spirit of Marxian theory" that demands we "abandon the premises of the first volume".

The issue has been debated for more than a half century. What is new in Rosdolsky is the claim that it was not done methodologically, that her error in grappling with the problems in Volume II of Capital was "underestimation the so-called Hegelian inheritance in Marx's thought" in the first place. The irony is that what he cites as proof was her criticism, not of Vol. II, but Vol. I. So accurate was she even the dialectics of Accumulation of Capital that far from "underestimating Hegelian inheritance", she hit against Marx's "famous Volume I of Capital with it's Hegelian Ricochet ornaments" while the European (October 1917) wrote "is quite aberrant to me." Rosdolsky, however, presents this in a very different way, exposing "the dialectic content hiding behind Marx's Hegelian style"—as if style were the issue.
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In truth, it is his blindness to dialectics as content as well as form, as self-movement, self-development, self-criticism, with internal being the objectification, manifestation, the non-human. By the end of his 445 pages of exposition, Roudabczyk succeeds in reducing to absurdity the very meaning of the word, the very specific word that Marx and Marx alone used to precisely and originally designate.

Where Marx used the word to prove the power of capitalist alienation or to labor, reducing man to thing, Roudabczyk applies it to economic category, entitling his conclusion: “The Retention of Economic Categories...” While Marx demonstrated that the mystification of economic categories, the fetishism of commodities, all arise from the very “permanency” (Marx’s expression) of relation of object to subject, relations between men assuming the “fantastic form of relations between things,” Roudabczyk posits mystification of things on a par with “reification of labor”.

Moreover, he not only introduces the reason why the perversion of subject to object assumes that form is due to the fact that, in the process of production, what is production realizes “realities”; laborers are mere appendages to machines. The reader can now see why my criticism of Roudabczyk is so narrow. The Grundrisse meant, not a way of playing down the importance of Grundrisse, but stressing that, in form, and in content and articulation of economic categories, economic laws of development through contradiction and crisis—“the law of motion of capital to its collapse”—Marx’s final statement is not in Grundrisse, but in Capital.

Roudabczyk, however, is preoccupied with the changes “in general” rather than in the particular, with a number of books rather than changes within the first volume of Capital, where, in his work, are implied Marx’s fully printed for the first time, 1867. After that, he again introduces changes he considered so important that he asked even those who had read it in the original to read the new French edition (1975-77) since it “preserves the original.” On the other hand, is veritably obsessed with “the movement from the abstract to the concrete” as if the dialectic never got to the concrete.

It is true Roudabczyk has made some valuable contributions, the most important being to make clear that the humanism of the young Marx, 1844, the relations of the master and the worker, the Marx of the Grundrisse, 1858-59, and the “scientific” socialism of 1867-68, are all one and the same. It is merely valid when the one who says this is not a “Hegelian Marxist,” but an “economist.”

It is also valuable when Roudabczyk demonstrates that, although Marx finished only three books after he outlined six, what seemed so much left out, like the book on Land Property, actually was incorporated in the parts on Base in Volume III, and Roudabczyk does indeed make mention of Karl Kautsky’s contentions: (1) that the first chapter of Marx’s famous chapter “Historical Tendency of Accumulation,” is a variation of “Change in the Appearance of the Law of Appropriation,” and (2) that the outline in 1852 was already the finished new outline of Capital, 1868, that Roudabczyk correctly states, would have meant “nothing short of disregarding the Working Day, Simple Cooperation, Division of Labor, etc.” (p. 177). But Roudabczyk himself fails to see that the writing of some 75 pages on The Wages Day directly into the “abstract” theoretical volumes I, while relegating to Vol. IV the remaining with all the other “Theories of Surplus Value,” meant an actual break with the very concept of theory, both as dialectics of thought and dialectics of liberation.

Indeed, Roudabczyk decided to conclude his “Critical Essay” with a special chapter in praise of Oscar Lange’s Political Economy which, 1931. Roudabczyk, in his ignorance of the deep roots of Academic Marxist literature which consciously, and in detail, takes up the question of the methodology of Marx’s Capital” (p. 521). This would, to say the least, sound peculiar to any reader who is himself alive to dialectics.

It was Lange who pushed to the defense of the Stalinist break with the dialectic structure of Capital and its total break to that break—the reviews of the Stalinist analysis of the law of value, when I translated that article from Hed and Ziemesska Marxisma (Under the Banner of Marxism) in the American Economic Review of Sept. 1944. The authors had proposed that in the future Russian teaching should not follow the structure of Capital. In my commentary, I stated that this was but the reflection of “economic reality,” that is to say, the state-capitalist, not socialist reality.

In the exercise of ..." as discussions of value would be, it is inside the confines of his study. Roman Roudabczyk has not a word to say of this debate. I doubt that is the reason for his silence, not only because he chose, as the very climax of his work, to end with a discussion of Lange, full of praise of his Political Economy for avoiding chapters in methodology. No, my doubt is due to the fact that this is not a question of debates, inside or outside of Russia. It is a question of the actual revision of Marx’s view that the law of value is the motivating force of capitalism. It is a question of timing— the height of World War II— and the Russian workers could now tell Roudabczyk that Stalin was announcing that there was to be no break with the existing structure of capital even after the successful end of the war.

As he said, what is actually at stake, whether Roman Roudabczyk was or was not economists, is the lasting ending Stalinist economics, unavoidable when the Soviet Union— freely associated labor— is in the process of industrialization. This leads necessarily to the failure to grasp with the dialectic. To understand how this is so we must return to Marx.

Marx wrote 881 pages of the “Rough Draft” of what would be in Capital I, the Grundrisse, and only in the very last paragraph he writes “The first category is which肇 greets wealth presents itself that of the commoditv” and then notes that “this section is to be brought forward.” To Roudabczyk he writes that, now that he wishes to single out some of the ideas of those chapters and work for publication, “before the deluge” that is, before the economic crisis of 1929, runs its course, perhaps even to revolution—that he must first construct a new first chapter as he doesn’t have one on commodity. And this he did for the 1929 publication, Crisis of Political Economy. But strangely it is not to be published than, once again, Marx is disassociated both with “the form of presentation” and structure of the whole six books he outlined.

"Which is less. I might add, than even Lange did in his very last compilation of his writings before his death. It is true he doesn’t mention me, but he does mention his own article in the American Economic Review, and there is no room to understand the that without knowing the new Stalinist theory, and its relation to it."
By the time — eight years later — Marx had completed his analysis of the economic laws of capitalist production and, as an active revolutionary, was head of the First International Workingmen's Association, Marx had decided to start all over. Nor was it only a matter of a new outline of three instead of six books. Everything was new, and nothing more so than the split in the category of labor into abstract and concrete labor.

Because Marx considered that split as the category of labor his most original contribution, crucial to "all understanding of political economy," he no sooner began Chapter I, Commodities, with their twofold nature — use-value and exchange-value — than he made it clear that that was not the essence, that he must at once go to the essence — the twofold character of labor itself. By the time he had finished that first chapter there was also a totally new section, the last, entitled "The Fetishism of Commodity." It was clear by then that he had "thrown out" what had previously followed Commodities, and Money — history of the theory of each category, all of which had been relegated to Volume IV of Capital.

The Fetishism of Commodity has since become not only one of the most famous of Marx's writings, but as bothersome to all exploitative state power, especially those calling themselves "socialist," that evidently they just cannot live with it. What Stalls declared necessary for "the teaching" has since been ratified, without any acknowledgment such as they had to make in 1948 when it flew in the face of all previous "teaching" by Israel and foes alike. Discarding, or making an abstraction, of the concrete, imperative of brevity-associated labor taking directly into its own hands, stripping away the fetishism of commodities, of Plan, of anything and everything non-human, and declaring, with Marx, "human power in its own end," immensely leads one to talented Stallsman, that is to say, state-capitalist "methodology."

Just as Langer's "methodology" was pragmatic, Stalinist eclectic, so was Rosolky's. Despite all talk of dialectic, and relationship of Marx to Hegel, Rosolky, by no accident whatever, concluded that one need no longer bits into the toy apple, study the whole of Hegel's Logic in order to understand Marx's Capital — one can arrive at the "same" end, directly, by studying the "Rough Draft" (p. 2011). You had that. All Rosolky arrived at by the end of his study of the "Rough Draft" was the quagmire of Polish neo-Hegelian which Rosolky called "neo-Marxism."

Thus does the dialectic wreck its vengeance on neo-Stalinist pragmatists who skip over Marx's admission that the Hegelian dialectic is "the source of all dialectic" as well as Lenin's conclusion that it is, indeed, impossible to understand Marx's Capital "especially its first chapter, without studying the whole of Hegel's Logic."
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Adorno, Knire, and the movement from practice

MARCH, 1978

TWO WORLDS

by Rayos Obantes

Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION and Marxism and Freedom

Negative Diacetics by Theodor Adorno (NY: Scatsbury Press, 1975)


The above two works are not only the most serious contributions to the study of dialectics in the past half-century, but path-breaking originals. Adorno's Negative Diacetics is the most comprehensive, and is not only one man's life's legacy, but a veritable philosophic testament of the celebrated Frankfurt School's total existence from its founding. These two works, written during the 1960-1969 period, are not the mere addition of new dialectical thought to an already completed system; rather they are new beginnings, new ways of thinking about and analyzing dialectics, which will probably be as revolutionary and influential as the school's earlier works.

By "nearly out of nowhere" I naturally do not mean Auschwitz was the reality of fascism, nor do I mean the suddenness and shock of introducing the subject-matter into the current climate of thought. By "nearly out of nowhere" I mean it is "wrong," that is to say, totally illegal, non-dialectical, from his own point of view of an adult lifetime devoted to fighting fascist "ideology" as the very opposite of Hegelian dialectics, its very death in Nazi Germany.

Perhaps a better word than "wrong" would be Adorno's own term: "naive." I mean that, as late as 1957, in Aspects of Negativity, he was -- almost -- defending even subject-object identity: "Subject-object cannot be assimilated at once more extravagance of logical absolutism... in setting the latter as more subjectivity, we have already passed beyond the Speculative ideology, not in its genuine, and more than simple replication of the subjectivity, but in its transcendence beyond it." Indeed, in Negative Dialectics he reiterates the same truth when he writes that, despite the fact that Hegel "deified" subjectivity, "he accomplished the opposite as well, an insight into the subject as a self-exalting objectivity" (p. 359).

Why then, the vulgar reduction of absolute negativity? There is the real tragedy of Adorno (and the Frankfurt School?) one-dimensionality of thought once you "give up" subject, once you do not listen to the voices from below and you certainly were loud and clear and demanding in their decade of mid-1950 to mid-1960 -- once you yourself return to the ivory tower and reduce your purpose: "the purpose of discussing key concepts of philosophsic disciplines and centrally inter-relating in their discourse..." (p. 3). Incestively came the next step, the substitution of a permanent critique not alone for absolute negativity, but also for "permanent revolution.

Now, whether the enduring relevance of Hegel has stood the test of time because of the achievement of the movement from practice, especially the revolt in Eastern Europe, and in theory, yet, Hegelian Dialectics has little to do with that dialectic of negativity, least of all with the concept of Subject, with whom Hegel distinguished himself from all other philosophers who left the search for truth at Sub-reality only. As "concretized" by Marx for the proletariat class. Subject is supposed to have been accepted also by Adorno, but again, he keeps his distance and originality locked in his work.

Naturally Adorno also keeps his distance from "proletarian" and theologies of the Enlightened Karl Popper of the IUFM. "Idealism and Fascism" he said. Nevertheless, Adorno: very nearly out of nowhere, suddenly brings to Auschwitz, noting some sort of kinship between it and absolute negativity: "Geneva is the absolute dialectics of the Concrete, of the subject-object relationship, and not only in IUFM's sense, but internationally, it is the type of philosophical work, it is felt, which has something very important to say, in a very significant way, to the Abbey and the anticipated Prague Spring, 1968, and, at the same
time, was a theoretical departure which said, if defeated, this can become a new jumping off point for the next revolution.

Thus, though abstractly and indirectly anticipated, it was no doubt that it was an attack on the working bourgeoisie, even if it was expressed, not in political terms, but in a philosophical critique of fetishized commodities. In his sharp first chapter's critique of the pseudo-dialectic, an important new contribution of Karl's, he reminds the reader that “man's fetishized praxis... is not identical with the revolutionary-critical praxis of mankind” (p. 2).

To try to draw from his use of the generic Man (with a capital “M”), instead of specific worker, the conclusion that Karl was not engaging in the revolutionary proletariat, in the manner of the so-called “New Left,” is to fly in the face not only of Karl's view of the role of the proletariat, but also his praise of philosophy as the “indispensable activity of mankind” (p. 4). Rather than playing a generic Man as opposed to the “classic” revolutionary proletariat, what Karl is doing in rejecting the reifiedist Communist concept of subjectivity, as if it meant nothing but petty bourgeois agora, and re-establishing subjectivity as, at one and the same time, the ground of Hegelian dialectics and dialectically Marxist dialectics of Subject which shapes his own history.

Koskis must explicit in his description of exploitation as resulting from “dead labor” reusing over live labor, object ransing over man, product over its producers, the mystified subject over the real subject, the object ransing over the subject. Capitalism is a dynamic system of total reification and alienation, cyclically expanding and reproducing itself through catastrophes in which people act behind masks of officers and agents of bourgeois Capitalism, i.e. its own components and elements” (p. 15).

Koskis greatest contribution is the redefinition of dialectics as the revolutionary pole of Marxism. We see this especially clearly in the crucial third chapter, which deals with Marx's Capital. Here, too, though Koskis sticks strictly to Capital as the source of greatest work, with vigorous analysis of both its construction and its development of categories, he manages, in turn, to make it an attack on mechanical materialism, i.e. the ruling bourgeois teaching of Capital, as if, once you counterpose social to historical, you have come to Marx's concept of the class struggle, not to mention the philosopher. As Koskis puts it, “Man is walled in by his social, praxis which in Marx's philosophy had made possible both objetivism and objectivism, and man's openness toward being, terms into social subjectivity and disinterested: man is a prisoner of socialism” (p. 16).

And a few pages later he contrasts this “societal” Marx's revolutionary way of saying: “Capital turns out to be the ‘odyssey' of concrete historical praxis which proceeds from the elementary labor product through a series of real formations in which the practical-spiritual activity of people in production is objectified and fixed, to evaluate itself and in the cognition of what it is in itself, but rather in a revolutionary practical action based on this cognition” (p. 111).

No one needs think that, because "Political Economy" is the most important chapter, Karl Koskis limits himself to either economics or philosophy. Rather, his work is a fascinating and fascinating critique of the glorification of science and culture, which he calls the metaphysics of science and culture. The Social Critic... will feel a great affinity for Koskis' profound critique of Fichteneer, and they will easily guess that its not only a critique of Fichteneer but of "socialist realism," Eskies included. He considers that Fichteneer's work on art lacks the "human scholarly activity which cannot be reduced to 'property' or to the 'spirit of the times'" (p. 77), and holds that Fichteneer's method is a "one-sided approach masking of enlightenment" (p. 61). In the land of Kafkas, the reader will know that reality is as irreducible to a great work of philosophy as by great works of literature and film.

The movement from practice over the past few decades that produced new theoretical departures, was by no means limited to East Europe, but covered the world. This was most brilliantly articulated by Frantz Fanon, when he wrote that the African's struggle for freedom were "not a treatise on the universal, but the unity affirmations of an original life proclaimed as an absolute." There is no doubt, of course, that once again provided the subjectivity of purpose, the unity of theory and practice is the form of the life, the emergence totally new dimensions in the 1960s, there heralded women's liberation as well as Black youth as well as labor.

It is these forces that made the New Revolutions of the late 1960s. What is needed now is the singling out of the dialectic of Racism in so inseparable a manner from the movement from practice that freedom can be made a reality. It's this type of role for new, revolutionary subjectivity, which Marx discarded. "Not only do the objective conditions change in the act of reproduction, e.g., the village becomes a town, the will change a cleared field, etc., but the producers change too, in themselves in production, transform themselves, develop new powers and ideas, new modes of intercourse, new needs and new language" (Endnote).

*Frantz Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth (NY: Grove Press, 1963), p. 32.
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Battle of Ideas: a syllabus for study

APRIL, 1978

TWO WORLDS

by Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION

and Marxism and Freedom

(Editors' Note: A series of classes around our new pamphlet, Marx's Capital and Today's Global Crisis, is currently being held in several cities across the country. We print below, for the interest and use of all our readers, excerpts from a special syllabus prepared for those classes by Raya Dunayevskaya.)

Introduction Note: Nothing is more crucial for the actual struggles of liberation than the way one preaches, theoretically, for revolution. Though the single word, dialectic, sums up both aspects and projects the needed self-organization in such historic dimensions as Lenin's in his encounters with Hegel's Science of Logic at the simultaneous outbreak of World War I and collapse of the Second International, no word is less understood and more degraded. The latest twist is achieved by the crudest Russian Rosdolshky. His arrogant use of the word, dialectic, with the word, methodology, is only to reduce both to mere prepossession. And, while he supposedly follows Lenin's warning that, without understanding "the whole of Hegel's Logic... it is impossible completely to understand Marx's Capital," he—by no accident—leaves out the last three words of Lenin's generalization: "especially Chapter 1." Rosdolshky thus arrives at the absurd conclusion, now that he has Grundrisse at hand, that "one can no longer have to bite into the sour apple (Hegel's Science of Logic)... One can arrive at the same exact, directly by studying the rough draft, that is to say, the Grundrisse, (The Making of Marx's Capital, p. 570.)

Marx decided to put aside the Grundrisse, not just because of the economic laws he was tracing through to their culmination in the "Law of motion of capitalism's collapse, but because of the emergence of "new positions and new forces" for the reorganization of society.

Rosdolshky hardly mentions a single objective event that occurred in that period between Grundrisse and Capital. One cannot get a whiff of what happened between the 1859-63 and the second (1872-4) which followed the Paris Commune and which Marx asked the reader to read even if he had already read the first, as it contained new changes (especially in the Habitation of Commerce and Accumulation of Capital) which contained "ontological value independent of the original."

Instead, Rosdolshky so clings to the Grundrisse that it is difficult to see why Marx changed the "rough draft," why, in a word, Capital alone is Marx's final statement on his new continent of thought—Historical Materialism, Dialectics of Liberation, Dialectics of Thought....

It is no accident whatever that Rosdolshky's ultimate chapter tools the Polish Statist, Osiek Lange, who is the very professor who led off the attacks on me in the mid-1960s for my revealing the Russian revision of Marx's analysis of the law of value and the break with the dialectic structure of Capital.

This is the breaking point with Marxism for our age. Stalin initiated it in 1943, up to then his transformation of the first workers' state into its opposite, a state-capitalist society, had not dared to lay hands directly on Marx's greatest theoretic work. By the mid-1960s, the totalitarian state-power now no need to acknowledge that it had ever been "taught" otherwise. Whereupon, suddenly, both Trotskyists and Maoists followed suit. In a word, once labor was not the creative force of a new classless society, there seemed no place for the "independent" Marxist theoreticians to go but to fawning Stalinist theoreticians, no matter how "politically" the anti-Stalinist criticized "bureaucracy."

All the more quintessential is it to trace through how, for Marxist-Humanists, dialectics allowed for no division between history and politics, economics and philosophy, methodology, process and result.

Thus, along with the first (1943) study of the Russian economy, came our first study of the then unknown Humanist Essays of Marx; and, along with the crises ending in World War II, came our concentration on dialectics as methodology.

Today, too, we turn at one and the same time, to the study of Marx's Capital and the myriad economic crises, globally.

SIX LECTURES

Note: Clearly, the supplementary readings cannot be covered fully in a single series of six talks. The exception is for Lecture III, Then and Now, which is the following section of Volume 1 of Selected Writings of Max and Engels, and Chapter 9 of Philosophy and Revolution, "New Positions and New Forces" is included directly in the required reading.

I. MARX'S NEW CONTINENT OF THOUGHT AND DIALECTIC TO EXPLORE

Harry Brighouse's Preface to the British edition of Marx's and Freedom, to the current booklet, and to the Scottish Marxist-Humanist pamphlet, "The Essays of Raya Dunayevskaya," are to be the framework for analyzing the birth of the state-capitalist tendency, 1941, to today. Along with the state of Marxist-studies today as they impinge on Marx's Capital, today's myriad crises show the indispensability of theory and practice.

Supplementary Readings: Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, Dunayevskaya, Collection of WSI Labor History Archives: Marxist-Humanism, its Origins and Development in U.S.

II. ENCOUNTER WITH MARX'S CAPITAL

Chapter 1 of Marx's Capital, The Humanism and Dialectics of Capital, Vol. 1; and Marx's Capital, Vol. 1.

Supplementary Readings: Raya Dunayevskaya, The Making of Marx's Capital, Parts One and Seven; Dunayevskaya, "Marx's Humanism Today" (in Socialist Humanism, edited by Eric Fromm).

(Continued on Page 7)

*The extensive supplementary readings suggested are not listed here in full, but can be obtained together with the complete syllabus by writing to News & Letters, 3800 E. Jefferson, Detroit, MI 48237.
III. THEN AND NOW:
The Objective Situation in Marx's Day and Today in the Writing of and Commentary about Capital.
Chapters 6 and 7 of Theory and Freedom: "The Struggle of the Civil War in the U.S. on the Structure of Capital" and "The Paris Commune Illuminates the Destruction of the Capitalist".

IV. A NEAR-CENTURY OF DEBATE AROUND VOL. II OF CAPITAL.
Instead of dating the debates around Vol. II with the Accumulation of Capital, 1912, we'll here see that, in fact, the first emergence of Reformism appears with publication of Vol. II of Capital itself and the first signs of monopoly capital.
Chapter 6 of Marxism and Freedom: "The Logic and Scope of Capital, Volumes II and III," first two sections.

Marx's Capital, Vol. II.

V. ECONOMIC CRISIS AND BREAKDOWN OF CAPITALISM.
Chapter 5, Section 2 of Marxism and Freedom.
Appendix to new booklet, "Tony Cliff Redesigns Lenin's "Theory to "Uncapital Utilitarianism."
Marx's Capital, Vol. III, Chapters 1 and 2 on Capital and Critical change only.

Marx's Grundrisse.
Supplementary Readings: Tony Cliff, Lenin and the People's Front: "Problems of our Age of Capital-isms vs. Freedom."

VI. DIALECTIC METHODOLOGY.
A summary of the study, including Chapter 1 of Philosophy and Revolution, "Absolute Negativity as New Beginning," as well as Chapter 7, "The Aesthetic Revolution and the Dialectics of Liberation."

Supplementary Readings: Ernest Mandel's introduction to the new Pelican edition of Marx's Capital: Darseyevsky, "A Restatement of Some Fundamentals of Marxism: Against Cartier's Vulgarization" (March 1944); in WSEU Archives Library, Vol. 1, Sec. III (3). (Reprinted especially for this class.)

Karel Kosik, Dialectic of the Concrete, Chapter 3: Theodor Adorno, Negative Dialectics, especially pp. 465-468, the very last three pages of the book, where he does try to return to the magnitude of dialectics.

This summary of Marx's Capital and Today's Global Crisis, combines a study of Marx's economic categories and their deep roots in his Humanism and Dialectic. The pivot is the concreteness of actual, living forces that spell out a social revolution—Labor, Illness, Women, Youth, . . . It is from the essence to regain the unity of dialectics of the liberation struggles and of thought. Let us not forget that freedom becomes the more virulent when women as Revolutionaries and as Naxim began to demand proof of new human relations the day before, not the day after, revolution.

The fact that every tendency in the movement—from Luxembourg to Mandel, from Lukacs to Tony Cliff, and from Reddick to Novak, not to mention all the myriad Marxist splinterers—has turned out to fail not Stalin's revision of the content and form, the dialectic structure and vision of "new positions and new forms" of Marx's Capital, faithful to the bankruptcy of leadership-conscious Marxism, and makes it imperative to recognize the historic continuity with Marx's Marxism, his new content of thought, of revolution, of vision of class-less society.

Postscript:
Because I felt that the new English translation of Marx's Capital by Ben Pimlott was a great improvement on the previously published edition, I may have given the impression that it is without merit. The Reader's Digest, which was somewhat misleading by reproducing the word "Victorization" for Verwertung, makes it necessary to take caution in that much used word. Not only was it not extant in Marx's day, but I didn't know that had it been. The Hegelian feel in the word realization to convey "self-expansion of value" is good enough reason for sticking to the old standard translation. I have no idea why Ben Pimlott chose the "practicing" word, but it conveys nothing of Verwertung.
Frantz Fanon, Soweto, and American Black Thought

by LOU TURNER and JOHN ALAN

(Ed. Note: Printed in full is the Introduction to our newest pamphlet, followed below by excerpts.)

Introduction by

CHARLES DENBY and RAYA DUNAYEVSKAYA
Editor, News & Letters Chairwoman, News & Letters Committee

On this, the 10th anniversary of the 1968 Kerner Commission's admission that "Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white — separate and unequal," it is clear that nothing has been done to change the situation that the 1967 uprisings throughout the breadth and length of the land had forced the President's Commission to acknowledge. Today's papers are filled with statistics proving that conditions of life and labor among Blacks have not only not improved...they have worsened. Whether you take the 304-page report of the Urban League, the three-day spread of the N.Y. Times, or the single column into which the Chicago Tribune, Detroit Free Press and others have squeezed a whole decade's neglect, the following facts glare out:

- Unemployment is twice what it was 10 years ago.
- Poverty has worsened and so has the death rate.
- And while the black middle class has grown, so has pauperization among the poor — and not just for those on welfare. Many can't even reach that level of poverty. There are families who, literally, have not been on a job for three generations!

The New York blackout illuminated the fraud in the long-known statistic that the "average" unemployment among Blacks is twice that of whites. Even the statistic that unemployment among Black youth is fully 56 percent does not tell the whole story. The naked truth is that there are Black ghettos where unemployment among Black youth is fully 80 percent.

WHAT THE PROLIFERATION of statistics failed to show, however, is that the dissatisfaction with the Government and the Black community's leadership — headed by that mouthpiece of U.S. imperialism, the Ambassador to the UN, Andrew Young — does not mean that the Black masses are just discontent. Contrary to the reports in the white press, Black America's actual rejection of white capitalist-imperialist exploitation, with or without Black leadership, is, at one and the same time, a time-bomb that is sure to explode, and a time for thinking and reading for action.

Put another way, what seems to be quiescence is not quiescence, rather it is the hewing out of new ways to meet the challenge of the times which would not again allow activity to get so separated from theory (and vice versa), so very nearly to assure aborted revolutions. To succeed, philosophy and revolution must be united. Which is why Black youth are taking a second, deeper look at the writings of a very different type of...
Ambassador — the Martiniquean Frantz Fanon. Fanon, who had given up his French citizenship to be an actual participant in the Algerian Revolution and theoretician of Third World revolutions, had come as its Ambassador to Ghana in 1960.

But nearly a decade before then, in that other quiescent period—the early 1950s—Fanon had broken with European values, and, in 1952, wrote that original philosophic work, Black Skin, White Masks. It became the transition point to new theory, and practice, of revolution. Fanon was the precursor of a whole new generation of revolutionaries.

By the time, in 1961, when Fanon wrote his masterpiece, The Wretched of the Earth, it was to be not just his highest point of development, and not only a Manifesto of the Third World, but a Manifesto with global dimensions he called "a new humanism." That its todayness keeps proving itself in reality as well as in theory was shown both at the height of youth revolt in Paris, May 1968, and all over again during the summer of 1976 when Soweto teenagers, rebelling against being made to learn Afrikaans, the language of the oppressors, were found, instead, to be reading The Wretched of the Earth.

Before his savage murder, Steve Biko, that leader of the Black Consciousness movement who made the link to Fanon, most direct both in consciousness and on the international stage as for the liberation in Africaksa, the Black Consciousness movement does not want to accept the dilemma of capitalism versus communism. It will opt for a socialist solution that is an authentic expression of black communalism... As Fanon put it, 'the consciousness of the self is not the closing of a door to communisation. On the contrary, which is not national is the only thing that will give us an international dimension.'

IT IS THIS, JUST THIS type of affinity of ideas of freedom that led American Black youths to identify with African and Caribbean freedom struggles and thinking. Petty-bourgeois intellectuals may not have noticed this working out of a new relationship of theory to practice that is itself a form of theory, since they haven't done the theorizing. But the American Black identification with Soweto and Biko, with Fanon and Caribbean thought, was precisely that, to Black and white American youth demonstrations against U.S. imperialism's heavy investments in apartheid South Africa showed. Opposition to U.S. imperialism's propelling up of Rhodesia while denouncing hollow words regarding "Black majority rule," words as false as Ian Smith's, is another such manifestation. Many are the ways for freedom is articulated itself.

It is a idea of liberation whose time has come, which inspired the Black authors of this pamphlet — John Alan and Lou Turner — to probe their own experiences as well as historic-philosophic developments. One — Lou Turner — came into the Movement just when the civil rights struggles of the 1960s had reached, one hand, a new point of development with "Hell, no, we won't go!" into the Vietnam war, and, on the other hand, grief shared at the very highest point reached in Kent, Ohio, and Jackson, Mississippi, against U.S. imperialism's invasion of Cambodia.

The other — John Alan — who had been in all class struggles as well as Black struggles from the mid-1960s, felt that the very length of his experiences demanded a total re-examination and re-evaluation of the doings he had felt had lacked a comprehensive look at the ever-widening gulf between revolution and philosophy. He also felt keenly the constant underestimation of Black American thought as if the Third World struggles were the whole and had no roots in the Black American experience. The truth was that the two-way road from Africa to America and back, indeed the triangular — African-West Indian-American — development of ideas which led to actual liberation movements, had started way back when all capitalism saw was a triangular trade of slaves, rum, molasses.

Karl Marx had been the first to graphically and profoundly sum up the beginnings of capitalism:

"The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and extermination in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a commercial hunting-ground of black-skinned, signalled the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production."

And what his new continent of thought—Historic Materialism—be it called a "new humanism" as Marx to point to as the path of world revolution was the "new forces and new passions" that would not only destroy the old capitalistic society but create the new, class-less social order on truly human foundations. Bound by this vision, the authors of Fanon, Soweto and American Black Thought wish to trace the triangular development of ideas and actual achievement of liberation, not for history's sake, but as preparation for the American revolution-to-be.

News & Letters, both as paper and as organization, is proud to publish their study and appeal to the whole Left to rise to the challenge of the times beset by myriad crises, as well as to open new roads of revolution in thought as in fact. When Frantz Fanon declared that the colonial fight for freedom was "not a treatise on the universal, but the unity affirmation of an original idea propounded as an absolute," he was, in fact, laying the foundation for the Absolute Idea — the unity of theory and practice — not just as a summation up, a totality of past and present, but what we call new beginnings for the future. Revolutionary Black thought, whether it comes from Asia (South Asia), Africa, the Caribbean, or the United States, is not end, but prologue to action. We invite all readers to join our authors in working out the imperative task they set for themselves to theoretically prepare for the American revolution-to-be.

The Latin American revolutions: where to next? JUNE, 1978

By Reyes Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

EDITOR'S NOTE: We print below excerpts from a new Political-Philosophical Letter by Reyes Dunayevskaya, which appears on her return from her national lecture tour. The letter's subject is the new Latin American revolutions, which include the Cuban revolution in Cuba, the Palestinian resistance in Palestine, and the Nicaraguan guerrilla movement. It is printed in English for the first time.

If the more than two dozen talks I gave on this spring's lecture tour—ranging from "Cuba's Philo-sophy of Praxis vs. Eurocommunism" to "F. Fanon, Sartre, and American Black Thought"; from "Bolsheviks and Women's Liberation Movement" to "Today's Global Crisis, Marx's CAPITAL and the Reagan Who Try To Truncate It"—the talk that produced the most probing discussions was the one given at California State University on "The Latin American Unfinished Revolutions: Where to Next?" This is due to the fact that the discussion led to it transformed the question "Where to Next?" from one of "programs and tactics" as was the case heretofore, to one of methodology and a philosophy of revolution.

In the 1960s the discussions around the New Divide—the Cuban Revolution—were nearly totally unfruitful both because of the great enthusiasm over its success against both Fascism and that which withstood 80 miles from its shore, U.S. imperialism, and because of the hope that it would initiate a new age of revolutions on a new level, in a new world. But the new question now posed was: How could it be that Cuba—which made its revolution by its own force and in its own terms—and Fidel, which had declared to be "humanistic"—was now so drastically opposed to Russia, globally, as to declare Cuba a "land going toward socialism" and oppose the Cuban liberation struggle fight Cuba had to long championed?

One African called the Cubans "mercenaries," and I was asked in no uncertain terms to explain, claiming that no doubt, if I were Eretrian, I could easily sound as Mussolini as those who declare Russia to be "Fascist. No. 1." But that the Fuehrer's "unctuous evil" has always been to the fore the greater evil, be it U.S. imperialism or Russian. The young man replied that first, he was not Eretrian, but Ethiopian, and that a genuine socialist revolution is exactly what the liberation struggles within Ethiopia aimed at, as against Cil Mengo, Mengo. But, continued the young man, the truth is always concrete, and, concretely, the Cubans are not revolutionary but counter-revolutionaries in Ethiopia.

WHERE, IN THE 1960s and early 70s, discussion in the Left centered around "Leninist Theories," today discussion is around the unfulfilled nature of all Third World revolutions... Today, Third Worldism is declared to be the "humanism" as in Gherard Chaliand's Third Revolution in the Third World. It is by no means a work by some reactionary outsider, but a Left "participant" who actually designates himself. It is this that makes Chaliand's work a very welcome contribution to the present discussion of what to do now that the revolutions in the Third World have remained unfulfilled.

He answers unequivocally with what he calls "decisive affiliation: The Faro Thesis as a Theory of History." He shows that, first, the only peasant and urban guerillas that had any success were those that were social as well as national struggles, that is to say, class. Secondly he now acknowledges that "the most important weakness is the conceptual" (p. 179) Understanding from drawing the "conceptual" to a logical conclusion as a logical foundation of liberation. Chaliand himself reduces it to "social and political terms," which is hardly more than Trotskyist paraphrases, though he rejects Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution.

AS FAR BACK AS 1962, Belavia had a national and social revolution, which the Trotskyists tried to take a leading role. They have learned little from their popular frontism, which only paved the way for retrogression. That the failure to see that question assures the repetition of laying the ground for even more tragic failures was seen as recently as 1971, when the new elections in Germany. In Russia, Trotskyists can find nothing sharper to accuse Fidel of than "empiricism on the question of Stalinism." It is not empiricism that is the question. It is the critical determination—the class nature, the capitalist class nature, of Stalinism, which is, after all, but the Russian name for the world phenomenon that now is state-capitalism. And it is the blindness to this reality which assures continued Trotskyist tailoring of Communism.

THE SPECIFIC TERRAIN of Latin America brought to my mind the development of the Argentine revolutionary, Silvio Prostafi. On the end of the first covers from under Russia's totalitarianism—the June, 1960, uprising in East Germany—Prostafi began a new type of thinking into the origins of Marx's new concept of thought he called a "new Humanism.

Prostafi wrote: "The recent publication of the Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844 and of the German Ideology serve to illuminate many important aspects of dialectical materialism, making urgent and indispensable a new study of theory that would allow us to account the humanism in them and in The Holy Family. The whole question, the whole question of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, as well as the later conceptions that would contradict his, the whole question of the different philosophical principles in their early works... illuminates and enriches them."

Silvio Prostafi was a committed Marxist, an activist. In a letter to the leaders of the Communist Party of Chile, he wrote: "Prostafi had been in the German, of the party, and correctly, the Cubans are not revolutionary but counter-revolutionaries in Ethiopia.

NOW, in the 1970s, in the 1970s, the new groups that are appearing from the Left, which are searching for a new way to organize, have a new understanding of the world, of today the past two decades that would not separate the Latin American struggles from the struggle for socialism, from the struggle for socialism in Europe, from the Black Revolution in the U.S., from the new struggle in South Africa, or the new struggle in Western Europe from the so-called "white races" in China, much less allow Women's Liberation to be relegated to "the day after" the revolution. The new is that the struggle be considered as a totality, and as a totality from which would emerge new beginnings.

May 15, 1978
Reflections on Notes From A Diary, by Raya Dunayevskaya (Freddie Forest)

**Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks and the State-Capitalist Tendency**

Editor's Note: We print below brief excerpts from a new essay by Raya Dunayevskaya which takes up in detail the Philosophic Correspondence between herself, G.I. M. James and Grace Lee Boggs—25 letters written between Feb., 1940 and June, 1941, the critical period marked, on the one hand, by the outbreak of the Korean War, and on the other hand, by the General Strike of West Virginia miners. These letters have just been added to the Raya Dunayevskaya Collection, on deposit with the Labor History Archive-Walter Reuther Library of Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan 48202. They are available on microfilm from that library. The entire essay from which these excerpts were taken is available for 50c from News & Letters, 1000 E. Jefferson, Detroit, MI 48207.

* * *

1949 is the 25th anniversary of the first convention of the state-capitalist tendency as an independent organization in the U.S. It was also the last of a noted Johnson-Forest Tendency. As I reflect upon the fact today it is not, as previously, in order "to set the record straight"... rather, it is in the present of looking back at 1949, I realized that the beginnings of the division in Johnson-Forest had begun to emerge in 1949-50 in my translation of Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks (specifically his Abstract of Hegel's Science of Logic).

Both objectively and subjectively, 1953 was a great historic Turning Point. In March came the death of Stalin, and this signalled the lifting of an immense from the head of the proletariat. In June came the first-ever revolt from under Soviet Communist totalitarianism in East Germany, and with it, a new stage of class struggle, with the Hungarian Revolution, had clearly reconnected with what Marx's new co-fellow of thought, originally called hostile "a new Humanism". 1953 was also the year the Korean War ended, and it was soon followed by the Bandung Afro-Asian conference which signalled the birth of a Third World, to develop by the end of the decade with African and Latin American dimensions.

That is precisely the point. Why didn't the united Johnson-Forest Tendency meet the challenge of the times, as the decade first opened when, at one and the same time, there was the Miners' General Strike in which I was actively involved "and happened" also to be translating, for the first time into English, Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks? In 1949, A CORRESPONDENCE began, lasting nearly two years, on my translation of Lenin's Philosophic Notebooks. No matter what else was involved, which I will develop in full later, all of us stressed the fact that it was the Doctrine of the Negation where Lenin made his great breakthrough of the dialectic for his age of imperialism. Building on Lenin's coheretization of the principle of transformation into opposite from the Doctrine of the Negation, we would need to go the full length, to the Absolute Idea, to work out the problems of our age.

Yet, once we had to face Pragmatism with political resolutions and produce a summation of the whole decade of our work on the theory of state-capitalism — State Capitalism and World Revolution — we, indeed, limited ourselves once again to the category of contradiction."

The letters begin on Feb. 18, 1949, as I sent a covering note for each part of Lenin's Abstract, beginning with course with his notes on the Dialectics, Intermittent, and Doctrine of Being. I called attention to the fact that what James had referred to as central in Lenin—

the early recognition of "Laplace" rather than gradvaluation — had appeared in March, that is, at the end of the first book: "You will enjoy the notes on Being, which you practically skipped over in your hurry to get to Essence. It seemed to me one of the reasons was the necessity to begin with simplest categories, because both in philosophy, economics, politics and what have you, these simple categories contain in germ the whole..."

On March 15, I concluded the translation, sending Lenin's Notes on the Dialectics of the Negation, which is where Lenin concluded that notes could understand Capital who had not studied the whole of the Logic. I evidently was becoming conscious of differences between Lenin's and James's "versions" of the dialectic. The covering note to the last part of Lenin's Philosophic (Continued on P. 7)
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Nelobochko stated: "Let me say at the start that although you have entered into this conspiracy with Lenin, the outstanding difference between the two versions (of the Dictatorship) is striking. You will not that Lenin's notes on the Notice are as lengthy as those on the Introduction, and Doctrines of Being and Essence combined... although you spent that much time on Notice, and included its practice, the thing you chose most to stop at and say: his Shushin, his talk on the Law of Contradiction in Essence... (but Lenin) chose to single out the section on the idea."

JAMES FIRST FINALLY, on June 10, 1949, got to acknowledge the translation of Lenin's Philosophical Notebooks and my commentary. He wrote: "You are covering a lot of ground and it is pretty good. But after conversations with G. D. reading (carefully the time) your correspondence, I feel that we are still off the point... "Clearly, it is not I whom they disagree as foolishly as they did with Lenin. Indeed, they had not the slightest notion of what Lenin was talking about until July 5, when finally Gross did get down to the Doctrine of Notice as Lenin worked it out..."

She proceeded to analyze the major categories in the Doctrine of the Notice — the Universal, Particular, Individual — showing that the whole structure, as well as each separate part of the Science of Logic, was ground in them. This was spelled out especially clearly in her letter of September 4, 1949. And, having made a leap in cognition, she became most sincere against imperialism, and, on the other hand, as a critique of Bolshievism...

(She wrote): "Development is the absolute mediation of Universal, particular, and singular. Isn't this the Lenin of the dialectic when (what he is) growing internationalisation: Destruction of state machines when internationalisation is passed over the stage of unfolding national revolutions: "The struggle for national independence in World War II is an illusion and cannot fail to have reactionary consequences."

How can there possibly be such retreats, i.e., how can opposition positions be taken in what was worked out philosophically, when we were working a "Manifest" and when we were, in the Lenin: 'had it been worked out seriously, that is to say, had happened. But then that is speculation — no one can tell what is going on in another's mind — and I do not appreciate any indulgence in speculation. What I do know, for sure, is that with the collapse of the Korean ending Stalinism, the Johnson-Forest Tendency felt it imperative to have the SWP once and for all."

THE WHOLE OBJECTIVE post-World War II situation, which looked to rise for revolution in the 1960s, was once again plunged into a new war... All the more did it become imperative, I thought, to work out all the philosophic formulations and not allow our analysis of state-capitalism to remain as essence of economics. In any case, I continued to work as a philosopher as I began to develop the research I had been doing for years on "Marxism and State-Capitalism," the book that was to become Marxism and Freedom. I proposed two new points of departure: (1) Lenin's Philosophical Notebooks, and (2) the American proletarian as seen in the Miners' General Strike of 1912-13...

Nothing changed in 1933 with Stalin's death in March. Not only was I writing politically on that event, but I decided also to try out the analysis of the 1905-1917 Trade Union debate between Lenin and Trotsky, in the context of the 1960s, and again, with the American proletarian's attitude to these events. The Correspondence was called "Then and Now," and was distributed at factory gates. By May, 1953, I not only returned to the Absolute Idea in Science of Logic and tackled also Absolute Knowledge in Theoconomy of Mind, but also plunged into Absolute Mind in Philosophy of Mind, from which C.R. James had said, he "got nothing:"

Within six weeks of my Letters, an actual proletarian revolt had broken out spontaneously, and inside a state-capitalist land calling itself Communist — East Germany. This June 17, 1953 Revolt, which signalled a new age, was followed by the Berlin purge, and once again I returned to "politics," writing the lead for the very first issue of the published Correspondence: October, 1953. McCarty's Chili was in full swing and it took less than a year for us to be "dissolved." By then, Johnson was in England, but still "The Leader of the International" and "The Breakthrough to the Johnson-Forest Tendency," was great about that was that it permitted us to put our philosophical formulations in such a framework, instead of just "state-capitalist tendency," we have Marxian.

The very first mimeographed pamphlet we published was Lenin's Philosophical Notebooks, and I finished another two years of not finding a publisher, before the Mecabooks, along with Marx's Humanist Essays were printed as Appendices to Marxism and Freedom... 1970... until today.
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Camp David Summit: Peace in Middle East—or extension of U.S. imperialism?

(Because of the urgency of the ramifications of the Camp David summit, we are holding our column this issue and turning our space over to the following analysis by Roya Domanovskaya—Peter Mallery and Ron Brotenery)

They—Sadat and Begin—were summoned. They came. They saw. They did not conquer. No, the summons—U.S. imperialism in the person of President Carter—did conquer. But even he did not do it till the 19th day at the “summit” which convened on Sept. 5 and had the 17th as the deadline.

Whether the deadline was orchestrated from the start, or came about “spontaneously,” the more important fact is that, on one hand, the U.S. had promised to build—at a cost of between $200 million and $1 billion—two airfields “for Israel.” To replace those in the Sinai Israel coveted, with conditions, to Egyptian sovereignty. And, on the other hand, Carter, having become the “fall partner” Sadat had called for, could also show the U.S.’s full imperial clout to the global enemy, Russia; he will visit Egypt in 1977. It is the U.S.’s presence in the Middle East that the Camp David Summit was designed to achieve.

BEGIN AND SADAT, SEPARATELY AND TOGETHER

Begin may not have buckled under as totally as Sadat. He certainly made this all too obvious, both in the substance of the written “Agreement.” and orally, beginning at the very first appearance, in the midst of addressing the American, indeed, a world TV audience, by suddenly switching to Hebrew, acting exactly like the mother lapping into her Latin to make sure the children do not understand adult problems. No doubt that reactionary terror of war days has a whole host of other cards up his sleeve to cause the facade of peace to crumble into dust, or, more precisely the seeds of Sinai. But Begin, too, had not only to acknowledge Egyptian sovereignty over Sinai, but pay lip service also to the “legitimate rights of the Palestinian.” That he has so much patience, having first reduced the right to self-determination to an allegedly “self-governing unity” under Israeli guns “inundefined”, cannot wholly undo what he did, give, to which will we get later.

Above all, there will be a direct U.S. threat in the Middle East. Those two airfields are being built only “for Israel,” but one other doubt the purpose of Defense Secretary Brown’s scheduled visit to the Sinai.

For that matter, Begin didn’t completely buckle under either, though what he got, and what he demanded publicly—a homeland for the Palestinians—are total opposites. His dramatic trip to Jerusalem, which aroused so much mass support both in Israel and in Egypt for genuine peace, was, in truth, a gesture for a separate peace. And that not only because Egypt is in such deep economic crisis and there is mass discontent, but because as rulers, both he and Begin understood better than did Carter, the globalist, how totally “ominous” was the Oct. 1, 1973 joint statement of the U.S. and Russia for a return to Geneva to “cool down” the Middle East cauldron.

Let us not forget that the PLO was the only one to greet that joint statement, with Arafat saying he “could live with it.” And what, above all, we must keep in mind is that way to peace so scared the Middle East potentates that Sadat’s spectacular journey to Israel followed within a month, and within another month a trip by Begin to Beirut.

That there also unravelled the beginning of the end of the new orientation—Egypt-Israel as unit—is exactly what must be kept in the front of our minds if we are to understand Camp David and its ramifications today. That is to say, at one and the same time, the Egypt-Israel “unit” can blow up and spurn on the U.S.-Russia global configuration.

“Peace has come to our people, and our land” may have sounded as if it were, meant for all—the Middle East and the world—but the fact that it was spoken in Hebrew, and it was in Hebrew the day before at Camp David, and that he told the Israeli press that the Agreement “did not block further Israeli West Bank settlements or military deployment,” surely was a coded message for his cohorts in the Likud.
PAX AMERICANA

1978, for the Middle East, opened with such stiffification on the side of both Egypt and Israel, that, by March, Carter had to tell the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the "diplomatic process has come to a halt." Indeed, it was this stalemate that got the U.S. Senate to approve the sale of combat planes to Saudi Arabia and Egypt as well as to Israel. But even this did not end Egypt and Israel back to "negotiation," as was clear from the failure of their foreign ministers meeting this time in the setting of England. And July 18 was followed by July 24, by Kissel's recall to Egypt and his announcement that no further negotiations would be held.

It was this total impasse which brought about Yasser's trip to both Jerusalem and Cairo with but a single "handwritten invitation" to Camp David, which both promptly accepted as they really had nowhere else to go other than war, and Israel was already in one war—in Lebanon. That, technically, its army was out of southern Lebanon, but from eluding that chapter, is the open wound that bleeds "beneathward"; surely none on this earth is paying any attention to fragmented Lebanon that keeps being bled, though the civil war has apparently ended and "peace returned."

When, on Sept. 19, Carter addressed a joint session of Congress, he let it be known that Lebanon, though not included in the Agreement, had caused "heated discussion". As if that is not still another of the serious problems not "solved" at the "summit"—as the Middle East, Carter also let it be known that France may be involved. Having been the first to carve Lebanon out of Syria at the end of the First World War, France has taken an "approach of great experience," not to aid the Lebanese or Palestinian people, but to steer imperialist rule in that volatile region. For the present moment, it sheds yet another light on why the convening of the Summit conference was delayed one day to allow time to stay off in France. So much for no secrets at the Summit.

What was put down paper and grandiosely called "Framework for Peace"—which all others just call "Framework"—far from being anything "comprehensive," unified itself in one new accomplishment in returning the Sinai to Egyptian sovereignty, provided that, within ten weeks, the Israeli army to dismantle the Israeli settlements there; and one questionable promise that, after three months of negotiations during which no Israeli settlements would be built there, the Palestinians would supposedly get "self-governing rule," provided (1) they close their eyes to the massive army—and even reduced in half, as promised, the Israeli occupying army numbers 25,000 "in enclaves"—and (2) they can "eject" that governing body, provided they understand that that they are choosing in Israel and Jordan, not any handsed for themselves.

If even were willing, for the moment, to forget that Oslo can only pass for a "comprehensive Middle East framework when even such "moderate" Arabs as King Hussein and King Khalid are not included, how can we forget who at this very moment is meeting in Damascus? Assad is presiding there over a so-called "consultations front"—of Syria, Libya, Algeria, South Yemen and, of course, the PLO—this time united solidly against the U.S.-engineered Egypt-Israel accord for a projected bilateral "peace treaty."

The fact that Syria is, at the same time, trying not to close all doors to U.S. imperialist diplomacy by agreeing to hear Secretary of State Vance's "outlining" on what happened in Camp David is hardly to be taken as a sign of any sliding with "the West."

Assad's Syria is not only still occupying Lebanon, but only is being threatened by Israel, both directly on the occupied Golan Heights, and indirectly via the neo-fascist "Christian" Army who are surrogates for Israel throughout Lebanon: but also is threatened from within the rejection front by the Ba'ath regime of Iraq, while Syria itself is in deep economic-political crisis. It is true Sadat is not using the language of Arafat, who is under the greatest illusion of all that 1978 is 1967 and Israel's very right to exist is questioned. But Sadat is a crucial country in the volatile Middle East which abounds in crises, from the civil war in Iran to the two Yemen, one "representing" Saudi Arabia, the other Russia, to.

It is impossible to go into all the crises besetting the region, and its strategic as well as all importance for the industrialized world, as the two nuclear Goliaths—U.S. and Russia—fight for mastery over it.

If one can call it "new," the one thing new that has been set off by Camp David is each side's fragmentation of the very concept of an "Arab nation," that all one can now see is the heavy tilting toward U.S. capitalist-imperialism until it sees the timing for global confrontation.

No answer can come from either the imperialist or narrow nationalist double-crosses. Only the masses taking destiny into their own hands can possibly put an end to the capitalist-imperialist, racist, anti-working class attack on the holocaust. One good sign came when 100,000 Israelis marched against Egypt, demanding peace. Another sign came from Egypt, where the mass demonstration has forced Sadat to put all the burden of inflation on the backs of the working people.

Even now, the major masses must contend with the rising opposition in its land and it is those masses in motion that can suddenly Camp David summary as well as all other conciliators who act as "speaksmen" for the Palestinians people, or any other masses strugling for freedom. These masses in motion have not yet had their last say.

Raya Bunayyabaya

Sept. 20, 1978
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N & L Convention: philosophy and organization

by FAPA DUNGENSEY

Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

Editor's Note: FAPA DUNGENSEYSA is giving over her col-

cumid to a letter received from a colleague fol-

toing the News and Letters Convention over Labor Day

weekend. Copies of her three discussion articles which are
taken up in the letter can be obtained from News &
Letters for $1 each, postage included.

Dear FAPA:

The question of the relationship of philosophy to

organization, which you have long posed, becomes mean-

ingful to me in a very new way during our recent News

and Letters Convention. These brief two and a half days

showed a tremendous release of revolutionary pas-

sion and action-of the "revolutionary spirit," to use

the expression of the eloquent black woman without

who spoke so creatively of her desire for a new way of

life.

Look at the richness of experience of those who

joined News and Letters Committees at the Convention.

Almost all are deeply involved, with roots in differ-

tent worlds: the working class-to auto and chemical

c, as Viennese artists, in working for the liberation

of black people—all striving to find a wholeness of

expression through Marxist-Communist philosophy.

CAN IT BE ANY accident that these "lower and
derived", layers of our society not only speak with us,

but join News and Letters Committees, in the very

year of the most explicit introduction of our philo-

osophical origins and development into our preconven-

tion discussion, and into the Convention itself?

And this year also brought us the Black Intellec-

tual who has been in every facet of the black move-

ment. He is Black, an revolutionary Subject, but

makes a leap to a new comprehension of revolution.

The impulse, the drive for a new leap, is a new

leap to a new comprehension of revolution.

This leap is not separable from the highs and lifes of our theoreti-

c development this year; to some extent, if not through our

work on Franz Fanon, Sowelo and American Black

Thought, but most precisely through the efforts we

hold Marx's Capital and Today's Global Crisis this

spring." The question of how new; the most explicit members of the labor

and intellectual, of black women, of black and white

men who have a deep sensitivity to the Women's Libera-

tion Movement-portends a very new period for us, and

in trying to understand how we could have this kind of

achievement at this particular period, I looked again at

the three contributions you had made to the Preco-

vention Discussion Bulletin.

YOU DISCUSS THE

what is crucial as a world

of the revolutionary movement. Hegel's Absolute

Ideas as New Beginning. He origins and develop-

ment by Marxist-Communists from 1949 to the period of our
current Convention. Chapter 2 of Hegel's Philosophy and

Revolution, "Absolute Negativity as a New Begin-

ning," was brought directly into this year's Perspectives

Report to the Convention.

Your article "Lenin's Philosophical Notebooks and

the State-Capitalist Divide in Marxism and Freedom" was

taken up in the 1949-50 correspondence between yourself, CLR James and

Grace Lee Boggs, as you translated Lenin for the first

time. Lenin's Philosophical Notebooks. From your article

I could grasp how crucial it is, if one is to develop what

is new for one's age, to not miss a single link of what

has been worked out historically, politically, before

you. If you don't follow carefully someone else's

revolutionary intellectual contribution arising out of

their specific historical moment, then you cannot develop

the needed revolutionary thought for your age.

James' and Love's attitude to Lenin's Notebooks

was quite different from yours. They were so anxious

to get to their own contribution that they skipped over

Lenin's contribution and ended up being unable to

make a leap in revolutionary thought. They saw Lenin's

"notion of essence and not within the confines of the Nulanian. They would do Nadia, but no

It was they who, because they did not labor through the comprehensively, became stuck

in essence and could not see Lenin's contribution in

vision as their point of departure.

DIDN'T THEY TAKE Lenin's Notebook for grant-

that leaving them partly as an abstraction? In con-

trast, a true comprehension of Lenin's philosophic Great

Divide in Marxism could not be separated from seeing

the historical and political ramifications of that philo-

sophic leap.

Didn't your grappling with Lenin's break with his

own philosophic past and led you to look historically

at the diachrony in the structure of Capital, and to study

Lenin's pro and post-1917? The theory of Lenin's philos-

ophy and political journey from 1917 onward, that is,

not just to analyze the of the objective situation of our period

state-capitalist stage, which all the state-

capitalist tendencies, including James and Lee had caught

but look further at the philosophic ramifications of

the economic reality?

In other words, you saw a state-capitalism, but

the new revolutionary forces of revolution against that—

specifically, in '49-50, the minors were on general

strike against automation at the very time you were

translating Lenin's Notebooks.

Wasn't it the objective situation, the subjec-

tivity of the specific forces of revolution of that period, together

with your working through the philosophical

labor of the preceding revolutionary genera-

the line of thought in the achievement of Hegel's Absolute

Ideas from practice to theory, bringing forth a

Philosophy of Revolution, "Absolute Negativity as a New Begin-

ning," was brought directly into this year's Perspectives

Report to the Convention."
AND ABSOLUTE IDEA as New Beginning doesn’t stop; it becomes more concrete and more carried out over a 25-year period. Your second contribution to the Discussion Bulletin, the Letter to Harry McNamara, the Scottish Marxist-Humanist, pinpointed the re-concretization of Absolute Idea as New Beginning from Marxism and Freedom to Philosophy and Revolution.

In Marxism and Freedom you had shown Absolute Idea as the unity of theory and practice, with a movement from practice that is so mature in its action and idea that it, itself, has become a form of theory and movement toward a new society.

But if Absolute Idea as New Beginning is the break-through in both philosophy and reality for our age, it is as its own development, Marxism and Freedom was published in 1958. The 1960s certainly showed the truth of a movement from practice being one of tremendous maturity, as with the Black movement in the United States and internationally.

But 1980, while certainly a high point of opposition to the powers-that-be, worldwide, revealed in its incompleteness that Absolute Idea as New Beginning did not stop as a unity of the movement from practice and the movement from theory. New beginnings as forces of revolution could no longer remain only new beginnings, or the movement would abort.

There had to be, as well, a reorganization of thought as a new beginning, a totality of view, a new concept of thought. If this movement of thought was also seen as a new beginning, then it would mean a pathway whereby the new forces of liberation could become the fullness of revolution.

For when philosophy itself is grasped as a New Beginning, by the revolutionary individual, the masses as integral to their movement toward freedom, when philosophy becomes the very basis of revolutionary organizations, then Absolute Idea as New Beginnings is not alone the unity of theory and practice, but becomes the totality of both, as the movement of liberation constantly being renewed. This I believe is what becomes spelled out much more comprehensively in your Philosophy and Revolution, published in 1973.

YOUR THIRD CONTRIBUTION to the Discussion Bulletin, the Dear Father Letter of August 1975, traces the process by which you are constantly reconcretizing Absolute Idea as New Beginning, here as the specificity for one of the forces of revolution, Women’s Liberation, for the period since the publication of Philosophy and Revolution. In that letter you develop your methodology of thinking about a work which had begun with a title on Women as Force and Reason, to one which encompasses Rosa Luxemburg, Today’s Women’s Liberation Movement and Marx’s Philosophy of Revolution.

This dialectical movement towards totality as new beginnings is, I believe, the same method which was within our Convention, allowing as many generations of the leap toward freedom to come forth. The recognition of self within Marxist-Humanist philosophy, felt by all who became members of our organization, flowed from the philosophical ground of Absolute Idea as New Beginning.

... ... ...

IN RETURNING TO OUR Convention I want to conclude on our Executive Session, where you gave a new vantage point for looking at revolutionary leadership in our age. It is not based on the history of party or program of the Marxist movement, the vantage point of the old Marxist organizations and of the so-called Marxist organizations today. In looking at only party and program, they have distanced too much of both, and have totally departed from revolutionary leadership as theoretic preparation for actual revolution as well as for “the day after” victory when the recovery emerges all over again to suffice the new creativity from below, fully released.

Our vantage point is in the historic mirror of revolutionary philosophy, not separated from organization. Otherwise, Leninism, the organizer of mass organizations, will take us as it has taken all revolutionaries, Lenin included. That was the most shocking point and also the most arresting.

The responsibility in the revolutionary movement becomes so much greater: the working out of the revolutionary philosophical content is not only integral to the self-sufficiency of masses as Leninists, but cannot be separated from organization, if we are not to fall into the old quagmire of vanguardism. All the more imperative, it seems to me, is the working out of a new form of organization which we began with committees rather than party form of organization. Don’t you think that is what Rudolf Bahro is trying to do, though he sits in jail in East Germany?

 Eugene Walker
 September 9, 1978
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The dialectic of today's crises and revolts

by INSA Densusius
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

We print below, brief excerpts from the Introduction and Part IV of Insa Densusius's Perspectives Report, given to the Convention of News and Letters Committees on Sept. 2. The entire Report has been reproduced as a Post-Convention bulletin, and is available from XBI, for $6 per 50c postage. See full ad, page 5.

INTRODUCTION: Whether the "China Card" is in the U.S.'s Hands, or China's Own, It is a False Alternative

First and foremost among the new contradictions that burst forth during those couple of months between the June 17 Draft Perspectives and the final working out of Perspectives we need to achieve today was the August 12 signing of the Sino-Japanese Treaty. The Foreign Minister of Japan, Sozo Sonoda, followed this up by informing the world that China had informed him that it (China) would formally abrogate the 1950 friendship pact with Russia.

As if anyone could possibly doubt that the Treaty was not just between China and Japan, Hu Kuo-feng required at once to Russia's imperial sphere of influence, East Europe, specifically Romania and Yugoslavia, and then to Russia's anti-American neighbor, Egypt.

What for outweights this gesture of nose-thumbing was the global dimension of Big Power politics with the U.S. The latter was, at one and the same time, encouraging Japan to conclude that deal with China, and using China as its card in trying to get from Russia the kind of SALT treaty the U.S. wants.

While the population of Galska, China, on one hand, and the industrial giant, Japan, on the other, are by no means just U.S. surrogates, (similar to Cuba or East Germany executing Russia's interests in Ethiopia), it is only very clear that Russia is not the only one seeking "legitimacy." The state-capitalist age is bipolar—Russia and the United States—and is historically nuclear, with each fighting for single world mastery. Which doesn't mean that we are already on the precipice, and that others won't try to position themselves in a way to make geopolitics sound "decolonializable".

THE SHOCKER IS NOT just that state-capitalism calling itself "Communist" indigens in capitalist-imperial geopolitics with our lives, exactly as "private" capitalist does. The shocker is not even that "Communist" Russia and "Communist" China consider each other "Enemies No. 1." since that shocker happened as far back as 1900 when the Sino-Soviet conflict came into the open. The new shocker is that not only is "ideology" used to cover up the jockeying for strategic geopolitical positions with the murder of Lamumba—Mobutu—and the mass barbarity of Latin American counter-revolutionaries—Pinche of Chile—but that Hu Kuo-feng chose to meet the flash of the very moment when a veritable civil war is in progress in Iran...
THE NEW BEGINNINGS Bahro is talking about, indeed proving, is to show that the revolutionary alternative didn't just arise today or with him, but "continues to exist unawares in Czechoslovakia." It is for no other very cogent reasons—he has already lost his freedom, has been jailed—that Bahro seems to prefer to start with Czechoslovakia, 1968, rather than with his own homeland, 1963, which began the entire movement from practice.

It is true that Bahro seems to relocate to Eurocommunism, but it is not at all because of what the Eurocommunists are in fact—class collaborators—but because of Eurocommunism's impact: "The Soviet Union would lose its Western periphery.

Nor could China's previous West European Europe, or Hot's latest trips into East Europe, transform Carpathians into Czechoslovakia (not to mention the Shah of Iran) into revolutionaries who can display what Bahro rightly calls for: "Promethean solidarity."

That needed solidarity can come only from what Marx called "new positions and new forces," for the reconstruction of society on totally new, truly human beginnings.

THE VERY FACT that this year a revolutionary alternative, an against Stalin's false alternative, emerged from East Germany where the movement from practice signaled the birth of a new revolutionary age as well as our very being as an independent tendency that rooted the concept of philosophy and revolution in that movement from practice that was itself a form of theory, needs to make us come face to face with our unique and historical contributions while we have tended to underestimate...

What was new that we heard was to disclose how Marx's discovery of a whole continent of thought—Historical Materialism, and what he called "a new Humanism" which united the ideal and the real—didn't just "take off from," but remained rooted in, Hegel.

Just as the fact that Hegel wasn't "innovative" that he laid any such ground for a very different, totally revolutionary generation didn't stop Marx's development, so we stressed the truth that has come out in our age by adding these three little words to Hegel's Absolute Negativity: "as new beginnings..."

No past generation could have done it—nor could the present generation who had not worked out the Absolute "as new beginning" for this age.

Creating theory, a philosophy of revolution, is as hard labor as anything manual. The writing of Philosophy and Revolution... manifested the subjective as inseparable from the objective. To execute this past year's task—the book on Rosa Luxemburg, Today's Women's Liberation Movement, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution—we have to understand Chapter 1 of Pukh, not merely as a chapter in a book, but as the historic link with Marx and Lenin, that "makes" the totally new—objectively as well as subjectively—concrete...
Iran's revolutionary past—and present

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom
(The following letter was sent to me by Raya Dunayevskaya, who is away from the office, working on her new book-in-progress, Rosa Luxemburg, Today's Women's Liberation Movement, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution. It so totally complements the lead we had assigned for this issue, on the civil war raging in Iran, that I print it in full, below.—Charles Denby, Editor)

November 23, 1978

Dear CD:

I'm sure there will be coverage of the civil war in Iran in the next issues of M4A, but I thought I'd like to discuss with you some of the past revolutionary developments there so that today's events can be seen in its totality, that is to say, not only as anti-Shah and anti-imperialist but fully revolutionary. For that, we need to return to November, 1917, because it was the ramifications of the Russian Revolution which spread throughout the world and included Iran.

The first thing the early workers' state did was to abrogate the Tsarist imperial tensions which for Iran meant the end of the old Anglo-Russian division where Iran in the north was Russia's "sphere of influence," and in the southern oil fields it was England's. It is new Iran that stands for oil, but as far back as the turn of the century no less than 200,000 Indians, many from the province of Gilan, were working in Russia's Caspian oil fields. The 1905 Russian-Indians war shook up the whole East and Middle East, since it was the first time an Asian power won over the Tsar. And just as, while Russia, it produced a revolution, so it led to the establishment of the first Marxist group also in Iran.

In any case, by 1917, the revolutionary impact on the Iranian masses, again in the province of Gilan, led to a revolutionary upsurge which, by 1923, actually established a Socialist Republic in Gilan.

Since it was a coalition of Marxists and nationalists which established the Republic, they no sooner declared for land reform and the liberation of women from the veil than there was a breakup of that coalition. By the time the Republic also tried to liberate Iran, it was bloody put down. And who do you suppose did that in 1927? It was the father of the present Shah, an army officer named Reza Khan, who soon thereafter crowned himself the Shah.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM PERMITTED his rule to continue up to World War II. By then, with U.S. imperialism's assistance, he was forced into exile because "the West" was suspicious of his dealings with the Nazis and wanted to keep the shipping lanes open for military aid to their new ally, Russia. That doesn't mean that they put down the so-called Pahlavi "dynasty." No, they enthroned Reza Khan's son, then only 21. Once again, there was the Anglo-Russian occupation of Iran and the young Shah learned he was but a valet of U.S. imperialism, Stalin's Russia, however, was not the Reds of Lenin and Trotsky, and had its own illusions about remaining in Iran, demanding, in fact, some oil concessions. At the end of WW II, U.S. imperialism quickly saw an end to that illusion and Stalin also learned that U.S. imperialism was the global power.

We know that U.S. imperialism was likewise not without illusions. It dreamed that its military might was sufficient to keep a new revolutionary upsurge from reappearing. The exact opposite was the case. This time, the National Front, strengthened by proletarian and peasant revolts, succeeded, by 1951, in putting Mossadeq in power. With it came the nationalization of the oil industry. By the time these events had developed sufficiently to put fear in the heart of the Shah and make him flee, U.S. imperialism had produced a global Cold War, which brought Khomeini to the White House, Dulles to the State Department and McCarthyism to the U.S. Within a week of the Shah's flight, the CIA engineered a military coup and brought the Shah back to power. The repression started at once; it was not long thereafter that the SAVAK auditor the CIA in brutality.

WE KNOW THAT THE 1960s were a revolutionary...
decade throughout the world. But the bourgeois versus the shah, the mass movement versus the shah, and the Islamic revolutionaries versus the shah are the main issues that dominated the political scene in Iran and the world in the 1970s. The shah's resignation in February 1979 marked the end of the Shah's rule in Iran and the beginning of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

FROM NOVEMBER 1978

The New World Order

TWO WORLDS

DECEMBER, 1978
Philosophy and Revolution: critique vs. attack

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Marxism and Freedom

Generally, News & Letters reproduces criticisms of
any or our writings under the title, "As Others See Us." In
the present case, I felt it important to reproduce it
in my own column because, as against Howard Parsons' scurrilous attack on Philosophy and Revolution, in
Philosophy and Phenomenological Research (June, 1975),
the sharp criticism of my work by the scholar, George
Armstrong Kelly, in his own work, Hegel's Retreat From
Elevation, will, I believe, stimulate a serious discussion
on the chapter "Why Hegel? Why Now?"

From Hegel's Retreat From Elevation, by George Arm-
strong Kelly, Princeton University Press, 1978 (pp. 213-
243):

An arresting chapter of a new book by the un-
orthodox revolutionary Marxist, Raya Dunayevskaya
is entitled "Why Hegel? Why Now?" These ques-
tions are broadly answered in the following man-
ner: "No matter what Hegel's own intentions... how
could he have stopped the ceaseless motion of the
dialectic... the end of his Encyclopaedia of Philosop-
ical Science?" (p. 6) This writer, who finds even Marx's 'cultural revolution' deficient in the full utili-
tation of Hegel, opts decisively against the interpretation of Hegel that I have been exploring; For the complex lineage of culture, politics and philosophy within the matrix of "absolute idea," Raya Dunayevskaya proposes to
substitute an unchained dialectic, which she bas-
tically "Absolute Method", a method that "becomes
irresistible... because our hunger for theory arises
from the totality of the present global crisis.

"Except for footnote 35 we have inserted text paga-
nations to Philosophy and Revolution." (p. 7)

(p.7) To the question I have raised about the con-
temporary significance of Hegel, she answers with a resound-
ing affirmative: "What makes Hegel a contempo-
rary is what made him so alive to Marx: the urgency of the
dialectic of negativity for a period of proletarian
revolution, as well as for the 'knots' of history in which Hegel lived." (p. 7)

According to Dunayevskaya, Hegel moved from 'culture' to 'science', i.e., the unity of history and its philoso-
phic comprehension. (p. 306) It remained, then,
only for Marx to demonstrate that action itself,
surprising thought, serves as a trigger to reconfigure
truth and reality: "...a new philosophy... because it rests
on the dialectic of human freedom which can be
realized..." (p. 277)

To quote Dunayevskaya once more: "The Hegel-
ian dialectic disclosed the counter-revolution
is within the revolution. It is the greatest chal-
denge ever faced by Marxism." (p. 277)

(35) Cf. Hegel to Niehoffscher, 20 Oct., 1806. Berliner,
I, p.523: "Every day I am more convinced that theo-
retical work brings more to pass in the world than
practical work. Once the realm of thought is revolu-
tioned reality can scarcely hold out..."
Certain strains of Marxism play with it (the Hegelian vision of the spirit's progress and goal in history as facilitated by politics), invert it, or re-expose it in ways that are frequently more profound than other solutions to the riddle of history in our times. If they are more profound, it is because they are more convinced that man has a meaning and history a destiny. To say that their own contradictions betray them is not to disavow their effort.

PROFESSOR KELLY, I FEEL SURE, knows that "Absolute Method" is not an expression of mine, but of Hegel's. There is no doubt whatever that he is more adept than I with knowing the direct references to that expression, whether that be the two pages (pp. 859-60) on Absolute Method in Miller's translation of Science of Logic, or Johnson and Struthers' translation (Vol. II, pp. 463-2). Or for that matter, the reference to the original German to "absolute Method" (p. 327, 1800 edition). Therefore, he must have meant to say that "unchained dialectic" is not something that Hegel would have considered his second negativity (which he called Absolute Method) to be. It necessarily remains a fact that absolute negativity is not something I "baptized" as Absolute Method, but Hegel did, and that Marx's singling out "negativity as the moving and creative principle" was precisely because of his profound comprehension not only of economies and politics, but culture and philosophy—and revolution. And it is again at the period of world crisis, this time World War I, that Lenin singles out that section as "not at all bad as a kind of summary up of dialectics" (Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 231).

Where Professor Kelly stresses Hegel's statement that "outside the realm of thought, revolution and reality can scarcely hold out", may I call attention to Hegel's statement on his praise of the idea because of its relationship to reality, "the pivot on which the impending world revolution turned"... (Philosophy of Right, p. 16). In a word, what we are disagreeing on is today, and our attitude to philosophy and revolution, when in the contemporary world it becomes philosophy of revolution.

In CONTRAST TO THAT scholarly discussion, and with full appreciation of the deep difference between a Marxist and no-academic scholar, consider the following documentary as well, as obverse attack on my work by Howard Parsons in Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, which passed for a review of Philosophy and Revolution: "This is philosophical idealism—a real aid and comfort to the counter-revolutionaries sitting on their mounting piles of nuclear bombs."

This is not the only time that that scholarly (sic) journal created space for a Stalinist type of professor to pose as "independent!". A decade back, when, after a whole century's delay in finding and translating Marx's Humanist Essays, there were finally published with serious commentary in the U.S., another such type of "independent"—this time Moscow-tied—Prof. Donald Clark Hedges, vulgarized Marx's Humanist Essays; "In the manuscripts of 1844, alienation involves a specific economic transaction between the aliener and alienee. (Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, Dec. 1965.) Not only had the editor of the journal published the uncorrected text, but refused to publish my critique, which held that, more intolerable than Hedges' pontification about Marx's "alienated (sic) humanity" was the journal's allowing Prof. Hedges to initiate ideological McCarthyism, creating an anagram with his claim that every U.S. scholar who, according to him, was engaged in "a salvage operation from Marx's own wastebasket", thereby creating "a humanistic image congenial to the academic community", was in fact "closely allied to the corresponding economic and political development within the Soviet Union."

What Philosophy and Phenomenological Research has been doing, by giving free rein to people like Prof. Hedges to attack Marx's Humanism, and now to Howard Parsons to attack Philosophy and Revolution, while excluding not only my rebuttal but also that of other scholars who came to the defense of Marx, was to close off any objective discussion. It is for this reason that I repeat what I wrote in my critique on Jan. 23, 1977: "At the risk of being considered "not" on the philosophical community, I dare conclude that it would have been far better for freedom of thought, for academia and all others, if Prof. Hedges had become an "increasingly irritated" at all interpretations of Marx other than his own to be ready to create instant cannibals." (Instant Vulgar Materialism vs. Marx's Humanism, NAL, Oct. 1977.)
Chinese invasion of Vietnam: global implications

(Because of the importance of the ramifications of China's invasion of Vietnam, we are holding our column this issue and turning over the space to the following analysis—Peter Mallory and Tim Brown.)

by Raya Dunayevskaya

The Chinese Communist Party Chairman Mao Tse-tung's declaration, March 15, that China had withdrawn its armed forces from Vietnam may serve to secure the improbable feat of instant history legends as it labels the conflict as a “victory” of the “aggressor.” It does little, however, to shed light on why a gigantic land of 900 million people, usually an invader, invaded a land of 51 million. The reason that the world felt at that invasion, February 17, was, after all, not just due to the disparate size of the combatants. The fear rather arose from the possible entry of Russia, leading to a nuclear holocaust. The fear was not as empty as it was preceded by Teng Hsiao-ping's visit to the U.S., where he never stopped denouncing Russia's “aggressiveness” as well as Vietnam's “Southeast Asia ambitions.” So much more accurate was Teng at using the U.S. platform (not the “U.S. card”) than the U.S. imperialists had so far been; using the “Russia card,” that Russia felt free to accuse China of trying to provoke war between two motion giants — U.S. and Russia.

It is necessary to look deeper into China's invasion of Vietnam in order to understand the nature of East Asia's ambitions in the world revolution and the possibilities of the student movement in China. In their demonstration on March 16, the students of Mexico did in their demonstration on March 16.

Creating Instant History Legends

As if to invade India in 1962 had been incorrect, China referred to that war as proof to the world that the China-Vietnam war would be brief, undertaken only to teach Vietnam a “lesson.” Now, outside of the immediate “to teach Vietnam a lesson,” there has been an intensification about borders, such as was alleged about British imperialism's line drawn between the borders of India and China. To create today's instant history legend, China found a map ready at hand, (it dated back to the Chinese empire) This does a title of imperialist ambitions. (We'll return to this later.)

The second instant history legend—about “teaching Vietnamese a lesson”—was meant to demonstrate its loyalty to the defense of its satellite—the Pol Pot regime in Cambodia (Kampuchea). Teng failed to explain, however, why, if that were so, hadn't China come to Kampuchea's defense when it was needed; when, from mid-1975, Cambodia and with the Vietnamese Army, Pol Pot's barbarous regime was overthrown. Why had China's retaliatory measures been just talk? Moreover, why was it followed by further talk that China didn't approve of "all" Kampuchea-oriented actions? Wasn't this distance between "socialist allies" being laid now in order to create a new battle and new allies for itself?

This more ominous talk does touch on the global balance of power. China's actions in Vietnam are not isolated, not against a single country, not in a narrow sense. China is advancing on all fronts simultaneously and its actions are part of a pan-Asian offensive.

The "Kampuchea" situation is a prime example of this. China is supporting the Khmer Rouge, a movement that has been in rebellion against the government since 1975. This support is not limited to military aid, but also includes economic and political support. The goal is to create a buffer zone between China and its enemies, especially the United States and Vietnam.

The "Kampuchea" case is a prime example of China's efforts to expand its influence in the region. This is part of a broader strategy to create a "Greater China" that will extend from the Pacific Ocean to the Indian Ocean. The goal is to create a pan-Asian bloc that will challenge the United States and its allies for dominance in the region.

In conclusion, China's actions in Vietnam are part of a broader strategy to create a pan-Asian bloc that will challenge the United States and its allies for dominance in the region. The goal is to create a "Greater China" that will extend from the Pacific Ocean to the Indian Ocean. It is a strategy that is designed to create a buffer zone between China and its enemies, especially the United States and Vietnam.
FROM RANDUONG THROUGH 1962 SINO-INDIAN WAR TO 1979 CHINA-VIETNAM WAR

The new spirit that arose with the beginnings of industrialization, and especially Mao’s victory over the corrupt Chiang Kai-shek regime as well as imperialism, recast global proportions from within the technologically underdeveloped countries where China and India declared a new form of Asia-Asian Third World. Chou En-lai and N.N. worked out a manifesto they called “Five Principles of Co-Existence.” Though Maoists knew that, without genuine social revolutions, Randuong would not usher in a new non-exploitative world, more thought Mao’s China would harbor ambitions of the Middle Kingdom as the “center of the universe.” To the shock of Nehru when he visited his co-bon, Chou En-lai, he found that the officially published “Manuscript of History” showed itself as it was under the Yuan and Ming dynasties when China had conquered Burma, Thailand, the Indochina peninsulas, had launched troops in Indonesia, and not only imprisoned the King of Cambodia, but also imposed an annual tribute from the Modern world, especially the holy city of Herat.

That wasn’t all there was to the “model” of the 1962 Sino-Indian war and the map, which had shown a great part of the Soviet Far East as well as the Republic of Outer Mongolia, North and South Korea, Cambodia, Thailand, Malaya, Burma, Annam (about 50,000 miles of Indian territory, in fact), Buteo, Sikkim, Nepal, the island of Sakhalin, as well as some islands in the Philippines, as having been part of China. No, 1978 and the Karakoram Highway showed us that that wasn’t all there was to the “model.” What, then, can we expect, in 1979, from the resulting China-Vietnam negotiations, having that 1962 model? Or is it now not just the Yuan and Ming, but also Ching dynasties?

INSIDE CHINA; INSIDE VIETNAM

WHERE IS THE LEFT ABROAD?

The only serious challenge against China’s invasion

(1) The map included in that “Manuscript of History” published in Peking in 1954, was reproduced in the New Republic, 4/20/54. See also S. Shiba Rao’s article on the subject of “China’s Borders” in the National Observer, 4/25/54.

(2) Once my analysis of “The Challenge of Mao Tse-Tung” in the second edition of Marxism and Freedom, especially the section entitled “Can There be War between Russia and China?”, “State-Capitalism”, pp. 319-325.

The Karakoram Highway, a 200-mile all-weather road over the roof of the world, linking Shandong Province with Pakistan, and where the Frontiers of no less than Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, China, India and Russia meet, was not completed until June, 1978. It was the true reason for the 1962 Sino-Indian War. See “Perspectives 1978-79, The Dialectic of Today’s Crisis and Today’s Revolt.” Available from News & Letters.

of Vietnam comes neither from other states, nor from the so-called left outside of China which is all too ready to jump from tail-ending one state power to tail-ending another. It, too, is busy inventing “new” instant history legends as to what is now the “vanguard of the world revolution.” No, the only serious class challenge comes from within China. Whether or not one is to believe Vietnam’s claim that there is an actual underground radio station in China which forces the camps to end the war, there is no doubt whatever that there is great dissent inside China against the exploitative rally at home as well as against their “foreign policy.” The wall posters testify to that. The strikes are sharper proof of the dissatisfaction with working conditions in China.

The official press finally had to take note of the undercurrent of revolt. That, the People’s Daily, March 3, ran an article, “Battle Grudge and FDL in Solidarity.” This admitted that “confrontations” were developing in the Party both against conditions of labor, and the war. This was by no means the only article. The foreign press reported also a peasant march on Peking, as well as wall posters, as well as demonstrations.

This does not mean that Vietnam is free from pronounced dissatisfaction with their conditions of labor and life. The truth is that neither were the Chinese soldiers at their “fighting best,” nor did the Vietnamese, who did defend their land, fight with the same enthusiasm as when they were fighting U.S. imperialism. The results of their victory over imperialism are bittersweet in a better life for the masses, much less participating in the decision-making by the rulers of their land.

And how exactly is the solidarity of the Left abroad expressed?

We repeat: It is one thing to oppose China’s
vision. It is quite another to play up Vietnam as "vanguard of the world revolution," or not only the Stalinist Mexican Left, but the Trotskyists everywhere are doing. It is a one thing to see, correctly, U.S. imperialism as the most serious threat to world revolution. It is quite another thing to think that it is the only real one, and that "the Stalinist bureaucrats in Peking are serving as willing accomplices in Carter's charade" that "in return for economic favors from imperialism, Peking is deliberately lending the prestige of the Chinese Revolution to Washington's anti-Vietnam campaign."

It is one thing to still see China "in a Cultural Revolution" against Russia's non-communism and playing with U.S. imperialism. It is quite another to act as if China's military adventure against Vietnam is some sort of minor deviation which the Chinese will "end and clarify."

Finally, if anyone thinks that Russia was declared Enemy #1 only because it was playing with U.S. imperialism when Khrushchev and Khrushchev created the first "Camp David Spirit," reared Mao's loyal friend, Edgar Snow, who, in *The Other Side of the River*, in the same crucial year of the Sin-Sino-War, 1969, was hinting to the U.S., unambiguously, "China's preoccupation with U.S. as the main enemy might veer elsewhere."

The shift in global alliances has been a long time coming. It has nothing whatever to do with any nature of "workers' states," as all are state-capitalist societies. The very opposite is the truth. It is because we are living in a state-capitalist age, where all state powers have only one "lesson to teach": a global imperialism reach.

There is but one way out, be it in China or the U.S., Russia or Vietnam, and that is a proletarian revolution against "its own" exploitative, racist, autocratic rulers. The biggest enemy is always at home. So is its greatest revolutionary force, and those masses not only as force but as reason. There is no other way to create a classless society of *"for* human relations.*

---

*April, 1979*

---

(1) *International Press, Feb. 15, 1979. As if the quotations above are not fantastic enough, the Trotskyist editor and author, Mary-Alice Waters, assured us—in boldface type—"the danger is not a Chinese invasion of Vietnam, but an imperialist maneuver that Peking is helping to cover up." Too bad that the magazine appeared two days after China's invasion of Vietnam on Feb. 17, 1979.

(2) The most disgusting articles of that gender are penned by a special contributor to the "Op-Ed" pages of the *NYT*—the University of Wisconsin professor "specialist" on China, Edward Friedman, who assured us on 3/11/79, that China's invasion of Vietnam proves that that land of 800 million "is refusing to be pushed around by anyone (little Vietnam—of) is mercilessly but cleverly manifest in its Indochina invasion." That analyst for post-Sail China tells us that further, we should not forget China's "commitment to proud sovereignty" as well as China's "original and anti-bureaucratic purposes of the post-1949 government (which) are moving forward. This occurs in a new atmosphere of joyous liberation from past terror."

---
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What revolutionary ground for women’s movement?

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION and Marxism and Freedom

I am turning over my columns this issue for excerpts from a presentation given by a colleague, Eugenie Walser, on my work “Marx’s and Engels’ Studies Contrasted: Relationship of Philosophy and Revolution to Women’s Liberation”, which appeared in the Jan-Feb. issue of ML. I consider it a serious contribution to an ongoing discussion around the manuscript.

Dunayevskaya is asking today’s Women’s Liberation Movement to take a journey with her, a journey into the Marxism of Marx. She is asking them to consider the most fundamental question—Can the Women’s Liberation Movement become a subject of revolution in its own right as a force, by comprehending Marx’s new continent of thought as a ground for its further development.

In taking this journey she is asking us first, to clear the debris of today’s false-Marxist theorists, such as Hal Draper, and women’s liberation theorists, who either try to unite Marxism with feminism or to separate Marxism from feminism, but without bringing themselves on the Marxism of Marx.

Second, she wants us to see that, in fact, not only in part, but only in part, their distortions stem from the fact that many had brought themselves on what Engels wrote after Marx’s death, his Origin of the Family. Since then, it has been claimed that this was Marx’s conception as well. But what the Philosophical Notebooks of Marx clearly show is that neither in fact, nor most crucially in methodology, does Origin of the Family flow from Marx.

Third, she wants us to see that, in fact, not only in the Women’s Liberation Movement, but in every social role, Marx’s philosophy of revolution is at the point of departure, especially in her contrasting of Marx and Engels precisely on the question of a philosophy of liberation, that it puts to the test all other interpretations of Marx’s thought, and challenges today’s independent Marxist to re-examine their thought.

PRIMITIVE COMMUNISMS DUALITY

Marx, in contrast to Engels, had a very different view of what was primitive communism. He too based himself on Morgan’s Ancient Society among other works, excepting it and commenting on it in a manuscript of some 148 pages. But his attitude was neither one with Morgan’s, nor more importantly, not one with that of Engels.

In Marx 1) the social and sexual division of labor were never made synonymous. 2) Though the family was studied and commented upon, it did not become the universal pathway to the class society that Engels tried to make it. And 3) primitive communism was not unconditionally accepted as classic.

In contrast to the division of man/woman, for Marx it was the relation of man/woman which was so deep, so profound, that it compelled him time and time again to return to its re-understanding throughout his life.

The origins of class society, as Dunayevskaya points out, the transition to class society were to be found within primitive communism for Marx, and not something which occurred only after. It instead had its dualities—and thus, the origins of class society were not alone in the question of the family. As Dunayevskaya notes: “Their Marx demonstrates that, long before the dissolution of the primitive commune, there emerged the question of ranks within the egalitarian commune. It was the beginning of a transformation into opposite—man as caste, caste as lineal, different material faceted. Moreover, these weren’t successive stages, but co-extensive with the communal form within its elements of a caste—aristocracy, different material factors. Moreover, these weren’t successive stages, but co-extensive with the communal form.”

MODES OF PRODUCTION, SUBJECTS OF REVOLUTION

The continuity of Marx’s new continent of thought throughout Marx’s life and to our own, lies in his continued return to the necessity of a total uprooting of class society—an uprooting by living human beings who are free for new human relations, beginning with that most fundamental, woman/man, was most fully expressed as revolutionary subject. The necessity to bring forth the concrete expression of drive for new relations through revolutionary subject at each historic period, as necessary to the final uprooting of capitalism, drove Marx to investigate most explicitly the development of capital, and as well, to study other modes of production—industrial, agricultural, ancient and medieval. But for any scholar to reverse the process and have Marx investigate modes of production as if that were not connected to Marx’s consciousness of the living subject’s constant striving to unroot social relations, beginning with production relations, is to reduce the thought of Marx to a cross-determination. And to reduce a revolutionary transformation of society to an evolutionary one, or to abstract utopianism. It is precisely the interconnectedness of the development of modes of production and the development of subjects of revolution which forms Marx’s expression of a “new continent of thought”.
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Though Exner laid open the ground, he cannot be responsible for the heretical vulgarizations that Draper has put him to. Draper's vulgarizations are no accident. They are at once connected with his attitude toward today's Women's Liberation Movement and to Marx's philosophy of liberation. His attitude toward today's Women's Liberation Movement is one of total elitism, one who will "teach" them Marxism because he "knows." It is his complete blindness to what it means to find a new subject of revolution, and what is the role of theory, of revolutionary theoreticians, in helping to give a direction to the newly emerging subjects of revolution, that is at the base of his unreason.

Not unconnected is his attitude toward Marx, especially Marx on women, which he is consistently ignoring or misinterpreting. Dunayevskaya points out time and time again where Draper failed to take up the crucial points Marx was making with regard to woman and social revolution, and where the points taken up are for purposes of transforming Marx's thought into something quite opposite of what he said. Can it be any accident that the non-Marxist women's liberationist Simone de Beauvoir separates sharply Fourier's concept of the emancipation of women from Marx's, while the "Marxist" Draper strives to make a false amalgam of the two?

Dunayevskaya certainly has criticism of today's Women's Liberation Movement. But so seriously does she take that movement, that far from wanting to "teach it a lesson," what she wishes is for it to understand its own seriousness as subject of revolution, a seriousness that can only be gotten when that movement is willing to come to grips, not with what Engels says, or even Engels, as great as he was, but only with what Marx created—a new continent of thought. Such a new continent of thought is no simple creation, and it is no simple task to grasp it ....

INTERCOMUNICATION BETWEEN THE AGES

What drove Marx back to anthropology and thus towards a new look at man/woman relations? One cannot say explicitly .... But most crucial is what the Paris Commune had illuminated for Marx at the beginning of that decade, the stripping off of the fetishism of commodities only by freely associated labor. It was the self-activity of the Parisian people, women quite as centrally as men, which had led Marx to add the ultimate sanction to the first chapter on Commodities. "The Fetishism of Commodities and the Secret Herein." Marx's intercultural as philosopher, as theoretician, was with the revolutionary activity of the working class, a working class of women as well as men.

In these Ethological Notebooks of 1908-09 the relationship of man/woman comes forth anew. Not because Marx "missed" it, but because so conscious is he of the only real science—history and its processes—as continuity and as ever changing, that in his continual diggings and diggings into its concretizations, seeking its universality, he finds there at each point that most fundamental of relations, man/woman.

So deep is the man/woman relation for Marx that it becomes the measure of society, not as a "replacement" for the class struggle and the necessity to abolish the social division of labor, but as the touchstone for the totality of uprooting that was necessary ....

What drives Dunayevskaya back to "history and its process"—this history being the birth and development of Marx's philosophy of liberation 1843-1893—is the same as what drove Marx back to study each mode of production not history, but future, an end to the prehistory of human beings and a beginning of their full-free development ....

And certainly Draper and other miscreants of Marx are no ground for our departure, as they fail to see either revolutionary philosophy or subjects of revolution in history or for today. Instead we have to base ourselves on this intercommunication through the Marxian of Marx and its continually in Marxism-Marxism of today. That is what will set the stage for the leaps to freedom which are to come.

—Eugene Walker
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Russia and China share global nuclear insanity

May, 1979

If This Isn’t Madness, What Is It?... 

On the October 20 the SS magazine bomb was exploded. If this isn’t madness what is it? 

No doubt one of the Russian leaders, head of all Khrushchev, will rush to quote Dr. Pauling who says that a 50 megaton nuclear blast would cause 40,000 babies to be born with physical defects in the next few generations, produce bone cancer and leukemia among persons now alive, and pollute the atmosphere for 500 years. Nevertheless the Russian masses will learn the truth. On what scale will they now weight the 22nd Russian Communist Party program promising utopia in 1980? The United States’ B-52 spy planes with atomic bombs and 30,000-megaton nuclear bombs, the Cuban invasion produced a double-barreled attack on the UN and the open challenge to the U.S. and its Monroe Doctrine. But all remained short of war even in Laos. The “communely realistic” in the Communist orbit, on the other hand, have been anything but peaceful. Their co-existence has erupted into open disagreement at Khrushchev’s initiative. It is obvious that China did not have foreknowledge of the attack on tiny Albania which led, in fact, an attack on her mighty protector, China. If not only the “real socialists” (Vietnamese) and the “anti-party” group in Russia, but also the “Socialists” (Albania) and “Katangians” (China) must be attacked, isn’t it clear that the explosion of the bomb is not only to tear the man-made world, but that just right inside the Communist orbit? 

Sure does Khrushchev feel of his home ground that he publishes Chou’s criticism. It means also: “You haven’t heard the last of this yet. Wait till I sum up. Until I do, just listen to those nuclear blasts.”

If it isn’t madness, it is only because we live in the kind of world where the madmen in power are the ones who decide what is rational...

An African from Southern Rhodesia I heard recently, speaking on the image the U.S. is creating of itself in Asia through Mississippi jungle justice against Freedom Riders, said: “You Americans see Communists behind every bush, and when we fight for our freedom, you ask us what we think about the space race with Russia. To us Africans that space race is really for the outer reaches of space—stay out. We want freedom right here and right now on this earth.”

May’s Bomb and Khrushchev’s Fall... 

In the short space of 16 hours the world scene has changed so radically that it’s very nearly beyond recognition. Or is it? China has exploded its first atomic bomb, and, like all other destructive agents from United States imperialism to Russian state-capitalism from McMillan’s Great Britain (now Labor) to De Gaulle’s France, the claim has been that this fluctuation with nuclear bomb was all born “in the interests of peace.” At the same time China’s atomic explosion followed so closely upon the heels of Khrushchev’s fall from the seat of power that it can be concluded that his downfall has overshadowed all other probable causes for the sudden shift in power from Khrushchev toward Jodl power to the new collective leadership of Leonid I. Brezhnev as First Secretary of the Communist Party, and Alexei Kosygin as Premier...

What matters the Western experts not the Comm-...
Khrushchev with a “sell-out” of East Germany to the West. We must keep this in mind when we read the official announcement from Peking on its atomic explosion allegedly because “The United States is now putting nuclear weapons into the hands of the West German rascals through the so-called multilateral nuclear force and thereby threatening the security of the German Democratic Republic and the other East European Socialist countries.” It is to be doubted that East Europe will feel safe under Peking’s “atomic umbrella,” but Mao is not one to miss an opportunity to create distress in Russia’s readiness to protect “the socialist countries.”

Whatever induced Khrushchev to attempt a new type of relationship with West Germany, it couldn’t have been very popular either in Russia or in East Germany or in Poland. Indeed, no policies quickly misses not only Communists in Europe but Europe as a whole as far as a united West Germany.

The new power struggle in Russia is of the same time, a new stage for the struggle for World power, beginning with dominance over the Communist world. While it by no means excludes a confrontation with China, this is quite unlikely at this moment. The point is that, again, all roads lead to Berlin.

The irony of it is that the Western Communist parties, who, value the “total independence” they have gained by the Sino-Soviet split, are now satisfied that they are now questioning the method of Khrushchev’s removal. Such a skeptical attitude is hardly what Brezhnev predicted in his first major public speech on Oct. 16, in which he promised that the party is striving for the unity of the “socialist” countries on a fully equal footing. What the attitude and the pronouncements do reveal is that the rise of the new ruling clique is only the beginning, not the end of the divisive forces at work.

News & Letters,
Oct. 1964
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U.N. FOLDMENT OF, AND CONTRADICTIONS IN, REVOLUTION

I. A Whole Host of Specters Haunting Khomeini's "Islamic Revolution"

Dear Friends,

A whole host of specters are haunting Khomeini's "Islamic Republic" before even it is officially established. There is the specter of a full-scale revolution in the very unfolding of the Islamic Revolution which, after all, witnessed a series of the greatest, most powerful and far-reaching mass mobilizations for months on end before the three days of Insurrection. Clearly, February 1979 did not only drive the Shah and his stooges, Bakhtiari, from the throne, but the manner in which the workers ended their general strike to return to work without returning their guns, as the Ayatollah had commanded, showed that only Chapter 1 of the Revolution had ended. It put a special emphasis on the complaints of his appointed Prime Minister, Bazargan, about lack of production. As the Deputy Prime Minister, Khatsev, put it: "Despite the Ayatollah's command, none of the major industries in the country are functioning because the workers spend all their time holding political meetings." As if Workers' Council, Neighborhood Committees, and student dominions in all, did not take on the appearance of a dual government, there came, with the celebration of International Women's Day, a mass outpouring of women, bearing the banner, "We made the revolution for freedom, and got autonomy," which has very well opened Chapter 2 of the Iranian Revolution.

For five straight days the women continued their march, and not only against Khomeini, but against Prime Minister Bazargan, and on March 10 held a similar rally at the Ministry of Justice. Nor did they tolerate the mass media's automatic choice of what they should represent, when they were asked to go and where they would stand. Instead of letting their protests go unnoticed and unacknowledged upon the mass media, thus exposing the fact that the censorship there is now abolished as total as it was during the Shah's dictatorship.

Nor was the Ayatollah calmed by the fact that the women had produced a scheme in the Fadakyan (and to a lesser extent also in the Hoolahids). For, while a good part condemned the actions of the women, others formed a human chain on both sides of the march to protect them from further harassment. That certainly was a great advance over the beginnings of the Portuguese Revolution in 1975 when the Left made attacks on women's demonstrations with impunity. 1979 in Iran showed, at once and the same time, that male revolutionaries would not permit attacks on women revolutionaries, and women were striking off on their own as a way of deepening the content of revolution.

Under these circumstances of ever new forces of revolution, for male revolutionaries to disregard how total the revolution must be if it is to uproot the exploitative, racist, sexist society, and once again try to subordinate women's struggles as a "mere part of the whole" (as if the whole could be without its parts), is to play into the hands of the reactionaries, be that the "secular" Bazargan government, or the Ayatollah Khomeini who is trying to "simplisticize" his Islamic "revolution"—that is to say, confine it to where he can steal the fruits of the revolution—freedom—and leave the masses who made it at the bottom as in any and all class societies.

The specters within the ruling class are not as insurmountable as between labor and capital. Nor are they only a question of secular vs. theocratic role. The fact that Khomeini nevertheless tried to keep some distance away from the planned March 5 celebration of the 120th anniversary of Nasserabad, who was the first to nationalize all the oil industry and shake up the Shah's throne, throws a glaring light on what he intends to do with his so-called Islamic Revolution. Bazargan, who did sit on the platform, was not recognized as any voice of the 1951-53 revolt and thus was in no position to serve as any bridge between the discredited bourgeois liberal factions. Instead, the persons who spoke first were Nasserabad's grandson, Hossein Motamed-Ezadi, who criticized Bazargan's stand on the extension of democratic rights. More significant was the voice of the Ayatollah Taleqani who had broken with the Islamic Revolutionary Committees in late February, approved, instead, elected, and appointed, workers' councilists, thus making sure that the revolution does not stop at its very first step, the overthrow of the Shah.

There is no point in underestimating the power of the Ayatollah Khomeini, who may now be turning as an Imam even if he has not exercised those specters haunting his revolution. That counter-revolution is right within the revolution, is the current hope of those who are exploiting the popular movements in order to gain the chance to restore their status quo. But it is true that the post-revolutionary traditional rural society can no longer be restored. What the Women's Liberators have learned so far is that not all women are alike, that is, after all, a slander to make it appear as if it were a mere question of women who are "socially" or "sexually" exploited but that the male chauvinism exported, and that included of the Ayatollah Khomeini, was the limitations of the freedom of humanity, the abrogation of the civil rights—political, social, economic, intellectual, cultural.

In the latter case—the most overriding for the Ayatollah—there are a few points to be made, for example, the printers, united with the Youth on what seemed most abstract—works on philosophy of revolution, on politics, strategy, on internationalism, to satisfy their thirst for knowledge of all to do with revolution. Thus, in the very midst of revolution when the general strike was at its height, the printers decided to work double shifts so that they could satisfy that thirst. As one eyewitness report describes it: "Books are flowing at the people as fast as soldiers' bullets..." they read everything about revolution. All Iranian books that have been translated into Persian are being republished and spread hand to hand and house to house: Capital, Paris Commune, Communist Manifesto, What Is To Be Done?, State and Revolution, Imperialism, Westernization, The Earth, Black Sheep, White Masks, Dying Colonialism. A further source reported a 1964 Essay on Alienated Labor and Inhumane Leaflets.

How hostile indeed to the bourgeois press that keeps repeating old official (SAVAK) figures that Nasserabad number but 2 percent of the population.
II. The Main Enemy Is Always At Home

The workers in revolution need no "vanguard party" to tell them that the main enemy is at home, that the conflict between labor and capital is irreconcilable, and that native capital has such overwhelming ties in with imperial ties that, if its life is threatened, the capitalists will certainly ask for imperialism to come to their aid in bringing on the full counter-revolution. But under no circumstances does that mean any steepening of the workers' own self-activity, self-organization, self-development, thus despising the revolution. That no sooner had Bazargan tried to reassert his full authority by a takeover of the oil industry than some of the workers' leaders at once resigned from the workers' committee in protest—listen to Mohammed Javad Khadem's appeal: "To All Oil Workers and Those Who Fight for Freedom".

After 90 days of our heroic strike, during which we have cut off all supplies of oil—all the livelihood of the reactionary regime and of its imperialist backers—and by the bloody struggle of the people we have succeeded in overthrowing the Shah.

As a representative of the oil workers—the heart of our industry—and as one of the initiators of the strike in the oil fields, I am writing because I can see that reactionary elements working under the banner of Islam are consciously suppressing the people's freedom and rights.

It was you workers who fought and suffered from shootings, imprisonment and the burning of our homes and still we did not give up because we all felt a responsibility to the whole of the people of Iran. Myself and other representatives were responsible for leading your struggle—better than anybody that it was you yourselves that made the victory—not anybody else...

We do not accept any dictatorship and will always support those who fight for freedom. We must remember and understand the nature of imperialism which still has everything in its hands. We must remember what happened in Portugal, Argentina, and especially Chile. Until imperialism is completely smashed such things can happen again.

This type of worker opposition, if it will once again develop, may be in the way to stop the attempted counter-revolution, provided that we, as revolutionaries, in turn, do not forget that to speak only of anti-imperialism as if imperialism since was responsible for the counter-revolution in Chile, Argentina, or anywhere else for that matter, is a deviation. It is a deviation very harmful to and indeed calculated by the imperialist capitalists. That is to say, native rulers will say anything, anything at all, so long as they can lead the struggle against imperialism, imperialism and the idea of anti-imperialism that many hailed him as a "revolutionary".

Or look at the Trotskyists; they are trying their best in Iran to give you workers a "working state" rather than the other nuclear-armed power reaching for single world domination, that they only lay the groundwork for the Vanguar Party—"Trotsky"—who are even louder in their denunciation against U.S. imperialism, as if it were Stalin's Russia that had occupied Iran at the end of World War II as U.S. imperialism and Great Britain helped keep Iran in tow during World War II.

May, 1979

III. Two Iranian Revolutions, 1906-11, and Today's

One look at the 1906 Revolution will reveal its...
out, independently, much as a secret organization, became Ansamem, a very nearly dual government—local units organized independently of the Shah and the Majlis by popular elections, defending their independence on the ground that there was too much bureaucratic corruption in the government. By 1977, these organizations were by then so strong that Tehran had failed to control them.

May, 1979

IV. Where To Now?

Each revolution discloses something new and unique and challenging. The new is the Iranian Revolution reveals both new strength and new weakness. Surely the Islamic revolution is unique in its depth and breadth, armed to the teeth and armed by Nasser since 1962 to take over the U.S. police state for the whole Middle East. It was nothing short of a miracle, especially when you consider that the Shah extended the Great Illusion to believe he would be pivotal to the final confrontation between the two nuclear Titans: the U.S. and Russia. Moreover, they were so spontaneous that even the Left that always likes to take credit for vanquishing the enemy, not the Shah, who did not order them to do anything, not the Shah, but rather the revolutionaries themselves.

Yet it would be wrong to think that it was only spontaneity that was at work, or that nobody organized it. Were it so, Khomenei, for whom one million poured out to welcome back, could not proceed so brazenly and so readily to try to saddize the revolution with what he calls "Islamic Republic" and "Islamic moral code," which we already saw at work not only against the women but against the life style of a whole new generation of revolutionary youth who are the very heart of this revolution.

Nor should we entertain any illusion about the "superiority" of the secular middle-class intellectuals who think that because they see Khomenei as "symbol, not philosopher of revolution," that some "greater intellectual" than he will win in the end. There is but one grain of truth in that pretension, and it concerns, not intellectuals, but history. There is no doubt that the great weakness of the movement now, and not only in Iran, is the lack of theory, a theory stemming from a philosophy of total liberation such as was and is Marx's Humaistic, his whole new continent of thought from the moment he broke from bourgeois society in 1844 until his death, 1883, that is to say, from his Humanist Essays through Capital and the Paris Commune to his Philosophical Notebooks.

It took nothing short of the First World War and the collapse of the established Marxist (Second) International before Lenin recognized that, without philosophy, without the dialectics of liberation in thought as well as in fact, a Marxian reduced to economism was inadequate. In any case, what is most relevant for today, and not only for Iran, is to do away with elitism and that quick divorce between the need for an "April Theses" to "reform the party," as if that meant Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution with its Stalinist underestimation of the revolutionary role of the peasantry.

Trotsky's illusion that the April Theses meant Lenin's "acceptance" of Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution notwithstanding, the real relevance of an "April Thesis" for the transition period now in Iran is not the forced identity with that theory that Trotsky built up. Rather, the plain facts of how it came to be is in what we see as the only way forward, where the Iranian comrades work out on the basis of the indigenous and the new, the revolutionary national and international fronts of revolution, their path to social revolution, their move from "February" not only to April but to "October.

It was the shock of the simultaneity of the outbreak of World War I and the collapse of the Second Interna-

tional that compelled Lenin to return to Marx's origins in the Hegelian dialectic and see that, without it, Marxism was reduced to vague materialism. He refused
Jobless Iranian workers demonstrate in Tehran as thousands more protest climbing unemployment and defying fire of Islamic troops. (See “Our Life and Times,” p. 12.)

...to stop with mere exposure of the betrayal. Rather, with Capital in mind as well as the political thesis of the need to “Turn the Imperialist War into Civil War,” Lenin delved into Hegel’s Science of Logic. Of all the revolutionary Marxists—Lenin, Liebknecht, Trotsky, and many, many others—Lenin alone decided that first of all he must examine his own method of thinking and doing.

In a word, before the April Theses was and could have been written, there came first, Lenin’s Philological Notebooks (precisely, his Abstract of Hegel’s Science of Logic). Then he worked out his theory of Imperialism—the confrontation with the new state of economy—monopoly capitalism on the way to state-monopoly capitalism, not outside of its relationship to the proletariat but as related to the transformation into opposite of a section of the proletariat that did gain from capitalism’s extension into imperialism. Thirdly, and above all, came a real live revolution—the Irish Easter Rebellion, 1916—which gave a new dimension to the “National Question” as self-determination, as “the bacillus” of proletarian revolution.

Finally the determinant emerges for that proletarian revolution—State and Revolution (originally called “Marxism and the State”)—and only after that could Lenin “create” the Party. Far from that producing any sort of debate about dictatorship of the proletariat, or dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, what resulted—and where we should begin—is “All Power to the Soviets,” that is to say, all power in the hands of the masses, their forms of organization, their control of production and the state, their smashing of the bourgeosie state, and by working out a new relationship of theory to practice, and the movement from practice to theory, the establishment of new human relations. We have, after all, 62 additional years of experience, have seen Russia and China also become transformed into their opposites, with both vying for U.S. imperialism’s allegiance! Surely we cannot behave as if nothing had happened in all these decades of maturation, shorted revolutions as well as revolts transformed into opposites.

There is no way to extend and deepen the revolution if Bazaarli is allowed to reduce it to a consultative role in the function of the committees organized by the authorities to run the plants and offices. The fact that the Prime Minister feels impelled to take to the air waves to decry against what he calls “the dangerous logic of Soviets” further exposes his capricious use of the elemental passion for freedom released by the ongoing revolution. Ayatollah Khomeni’s stopping the revolutionary tribunals against the state’s most powerful and vicious henchmen in the SAVAK and in the government has focused on just how rapidly he is turning the clock back, and it is no longer just as the expense of the women’s freedom. These acts of retrogression are not only dangerous logic. They are acts of outright counter-revolution. Let us extend our solidarity to the embattled revolutionaries—the new generation of revolutionary students as well as workers—Women’s Libersarians as well as national minorities fighting for self-determination. Let us extend the activities here to stop the interference of U.S. imperialism hungering for oil and the strategic location for its nuclear global aim.

The struggle continues.

Raya Dzunzukaya
Dutens, Michigan
March 25, 1979
Draper’s narrow view of Marx’s political theory

by Maya Dunayevskaya

I am turning my column space this issue over to an important review essay by a colleague, Andy Phillips.

Hal Draper’s voluminous Karl Marx’s Theory of Revolution in the hands of the Working Class in the Uprising of 1848 and 1849 establishes his authorship to be the first complete study of Marx’s political theory, culminating in the work Theory of Revolution. In any case, what Draper claims to have discovered is a fact his narrow view of Marx’s political theory.

In his second volume, The Politics of Social Classes, Draper presents “Marx’s” views of the politics of the working class and the working class movement, including trade unionism and the principle of proletarian self-organization; the historic roles of the bourgeoisie, petty-bourgeoisie, peasantry, lumpen-proletariat and intellectuals.

ARROGANCE AND HYPOCRISY:

Whereas Draper claims to have discovered all other Marxists deal strictly with the Marxism of Marx, he immediately exposes his arrogance and hypocrisy by characterizing Marx’s rough draft of Capital, the Grundrisse, as a “pre-book.”

“When the Grundrisse, Draper declares, ‘is a peculiar notebook, notebooks kept . . . with no thought of publication’ notes and jottings,” “A book since . . . a thought that popped into Marx’s mind—raw, reviewed, unweighted, uncontextualized, often ungrammatical, and sometimes intercursive,” “often scribbled late at night when Marx was the least compositor, gastronomic illness, headaches and assorted dyspepsia.”

In fact, the Grundrisse is nothing less than Marx’s comprehensive summary of his preceding 15 years of experience and study, comprising an introduction and seven notebooks, and totaling over 900 pages. The work, inspired by the economic recession of 1857 and the hope for a new revolution, was begun by Marx the last week of August 1857. Working almost incessantly, he completed it by mid-March 1858, except for a few pages added in May. The book, containing 315 analytical categories too numerous to list, is divided into two chapters: Money and Capital, including Marx’s analyses of the production process, surplus value and profit, circulation process, surplus labor, surplus capital, original accumulation of capital, theories of surplus value and profit.

Upon reading the Grundrisse today and grasping the great insights it gives to the development of Marx’s thought and methodological methodology, what is most incredible is that this great work was not published until 1932-35. In Moscow and in a German edition at that, which effectively precluded it from being known during the World War II years.

Indeed, it took nothing less than the Chinese revolution of 1949 to pry this work from the dusty archives to Moscow for serious study in the 1950s. Ten years elapsed before the most discussed chapter, “Farms Which Feared Capitalist Production,” was published in English as PRO- CAPITALISM ECONOMIC FORMATIONS, and only in 1973 did the first full English edition appear, published by the Pelican Marx Library in London.

Draper’s supercilious and arrogant assessment of the Grundrisse notwithstanding, Marx specifically refers to his notebooks in the first paragraph of the preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy:

“I examine the system of bourgeois economics in the following order: capital, landed property, wage labor, state and foreign trade, world market. Under the first three headings, I investigated the economic conditions of life of the three great classes into which modern bourgeois society is divided: the interconnection of the three other headings is obvious from the contents of the first book, which deals with capital, consists of the following chapters: 1. Commodities; 2. Money, or simple circulation; 3. Capital in general. The first two chapters form the contents of the present part. The total material lies before me in three volumes of notebooks.”

“The monograph Marx refers to are the Grundrisse, nothing less than the draft of all four volumes of Capital, Marx’s greatest work. Actually, the historic sweep of the Grundrisse exceeds that of Capital, tracing the full development of civilization rather than restricting itself to the precisely logical movement of the capitalist economic system analyzed in Capital.

ANTI-HEGELIAN SOUL COMPANION

A popular perdition of some “Marxists” is drawing a sharp line between the “young Hegelian Marx” and the “mature materialist Marx.” Louis Althusser, advocate of “driving this phantom (of Hegel) into the night” finds a real companion in Draper. However, both share considerable embarrassment in the existence of the Grundrisse, in which Hegelian philosophy concepts and terminology are so pervasive that any denial of their indispensability to Marx’s analysis is patently absurd. This is not Marx of the 1844 Philosophical Economic Manuscripts, a “young Marx writing totally within the
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framework of classical Hegelian philosophy (never mind that precisely for this reason it is the most devastating critique of Hegel's dehumanized idealism). Here you have the "mature" Marx, the Marx who has discovered the materialist motive forces compelling the development and motion of capitalistic production relations and its super-structured, class-conflicting society. This is no Marx merely "labeled" with Hegelianism; this is Marx the composer of Hegel's dialectical method, using it to disclose the development of civilization from the first forms of social behavior and relationships.

Where Althusser would rid Marx of Hegel by driving him "into the night," Drapper seeks to achieve the same end by trying to reduce the Grundrisse to a dysopic carburator grunt, as well as discounting Marx's 1844 essays as "pre-Marxist," still thrilled with the Hegelianism Draper insists Marx discarded when he elaborated his mature, materialist theories. The anti-Hegelian elitism of Draper and Althusser was totally alien to Marx. Indeed, as he was writing the Grundrisse, the "mature" Marx observed in a letter to Engels on Jan. 14, 1859: "In the method of treatment the fact that by mere accident I have again glanced through Hegel's Logic has been of great service to me." As noted, Marx considered the Grundrisse as the draft of Capital, his most important work as knowledgeable Marxists have noted, whereas Marx did not leave a Logic, he provided the logic of Capital. And as Marx himself emphasized, "The Hegelian contradiction (is) the source of all dialectics," the materialist dialectic included.

Drapper calls his work the result of "excavation," digging into the writings of Marx and Engels, relating their thoughts to objective developments. While merit certainly limits what should be fully elaborated, Draper's treatment of the following two issues reveals his own confined perspective.

In his chapter on trade unions, Draper notes that the "New Unionism in England, comparable to the rise of the CIJ in the U.S. in the 1860s, erupted in July 1868 with the factory organization and action of women match-workers, followed by similar successful activity of gas workers, activity led by Eleanor Marx. Action by these lower and deeper layers of the previously unorganized workers sparked a movement to organize the unorganized which Marxily transformed the economic and political face of England.

While the importance of these historic developments is self-evident, they are given an added significance by the current impact of the Women's Liberation Movement. But far from detailing the motions of these English working women in the apolitical struggle, Draper gives them no more than the barest passing reference on p. 111. Yet it is precisely this type of organizing of the unorganized by Eleanor Marx, which connected the "Marxism of Marx" in one of his last writings, as he called upon revolt: "I am unable to go "lower and deeper into the proletariat," a phrase Lenin first discovered (Aug. 4, 1914) after the collapse of the Second International.

On the other hand, there is Draper's endless preoccupation with Marx and the peasantry. Correctly pointing out that the myth of Marx having no interest in the peasantry is totally unfounded, Draper proceeds for the next 250 pages to confirm Marx's real concern and understanding of the importance of the revolutionary role of the peasantry. One is reminded of the expression: "Killing a mosquito to kill a flea.

Of many seriously controversial issues, moreover, there is little or absolutely no reference. For example, Draper devotes considerable research and elaboration to Marx's concept of "revolution in permanence." As Draper is well aware, the person preeminently linked with the theory of permanent revolution is Leon Trotsky. But in the 48 pages given to the two chapters on permanent revolution, there is not a single reference to Trotsky.

EVIDE MARXISTS

Drapper's defense that he is disregarding all other Marxists is creation pure and simple. This facile disclaimer does not prevent Draper from bringing in other "Marxists" when he chooses to do so. In effect, Draper wants to have his cake... and eat it too.

For example, where Draper maintains that the largest part of Marx's and Engels' revolutionary theory derived from their 13-month experiences of the 1848-49 German revolution, he quotes a 1907 statement by Lenin (irrefutably a Marxist) to buttress his contention. Now 1907 was a very good year indeed, the year of the Russian Social Democratic Party Congress made specially rare by the fact that virtually all tendencies in Russian Marxism were represented, and included Lenin, Trotsky, Lunachrsky, Martov, Plekhanov, as well as the Bund. Indeed, the central debates at the Congress revolved around precisely the impact of the 1848 revolution on Russian Marxism in the 1905 Revolution, and specifically why an understanding of his philosophy of revolution was necessary to grasp the import of the 1805 Russian revolution as well as forge practical revolutionary pol.
Draper's "excavations" into social classes appear to follow Marx's class lines on the development of revolutionary struggle, the significance of the 1881 correspondence between Vera Zasulich and Marx in the Russian question, and Marx's emphasis on the communal features of the state, in the form of Russian rural landownership and society, and inquiring whether Russia could go directly from feudalism to communism. Marx drafted four letters in his effort to answer Zasulich. He answered her not only in a letter, but most importantly, in his 1882 Introduction to the Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto. The last sentence of that Introduction states:

"If the Russian Revolution becomes the signal for a proletarian revolution in the West, so that both complement each other, the present Russian common ownership of land may serve as the starting point for a communist development."

Draper's blind hatred of Hegel's dialectics and disregard of Marx's dialectics of liberation betrays him at every turn, even in the point of attributing to Hegel what is purely Marx. Draper, referring to Marx's openness of The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, quotes Hegel to the effect that: "History repeats itself...the first time as tragedy, the second as farce. What is Hegel's, however, is only that history repeats itself; Marx added the rest."

That the scholar should not know that little fact—the very first sentence of the work that is so pivotal to Draper—proves but one thing: how totally blind anti-Hegelians can turn an excavator of the "Marxism of Marx".

Throughout, Draper equates Engels to Marx, and often very nearly ranks Engels above Marx. While the contributions and role of Engels in the relationship are surely immense, attempts to equate the two does damaging disservice to both and can only result in discrediting the revolutionary left.

\textbf{Betrays Engels, Too.}\n
Moreover, nobody более than Engels understood and appreciated the importance of Hegelian philosophy to Marx's development. The most convincing testimony of this is Engels' treatise on Peasant-lodges, which is nothing less than a total defense of Marx's insistence that the Hegelian dialectic be the basis of all dialectics. Written in 1848, when Engels was an old man, the work cannot be labeled an aberration of his youth.\n
Another observation is compiled by Draper's "de\-\text{fense}" of Engels as a non-Hegelian, materialistic Engels. Draper, like virtually every Trotskyist in the 1930-40 period, "grew up" on Engels' treatise on Peasant-lodges, so ignorance cannot be an element here. Draper's effort to divert Engels of his appreciation for Hegel is nothing short of betrayal of Engels as well. The last sentence to Engels' treatise is: "The German working-class movement is the heir of the German Idealist philosophy." Draper's work is indeed unfinished—but not because only two of the four projected volumes have been published.

---

7 This is not the place to go into the proceedings of the 1907 Congress. The point is that what revolutionary maximum which responded to Congress is ignored (if ever appended by Marxists) and the Congress itself decentralized the significance of 1881 correspondence between Marx and Zasulich.
9 "A New Look and Search of Profit, Demons, and Marx's Philosophy," Journal of Political Economy, October 1939, p. 355. This article critically analyzes Engels' dialectical materialism and Marx's dialectical materialism. Engels' dialectical materialism is found to be far from consistent and consistent in Engels' work. A chapter of our new book, which is about to be published, will deal with this important issue.
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A. Philip Randolph and Black labor's future

The life, the early life, of A. Philip Randolph is what needs to be remembered and what is deliberately forgotten by those who shed crocodile tears over his death and wish to remember only the last years when he had turned against the militancy of the new generation of black revolutionaries that had been born with the 1960s.

Historically, the genius of A. Philip Randolph, socialist, emerged as World War I ended and the Russian Revolution promised the way to a new, classless world. All that greeted the returning black soldiers were Ku Klux Klan riots and racist barber shop outbreaks of beatings against blacks moving from the South to the North. 1919 became known as "Red Summer, 1919." It was a description, not of the ascension of the Russian Revolution into the U.S., but of the fantastic number of racist riots—no less than 25 in the last months of 1919.

RANDOLPH'S TRUE LEGACY

It was in that period that A. Philip Randolph accomplished three pathbreaking deeds. First, he was the founding of a significant new paper called The Messenger. So great was its vision of a very different world from capitalism, and so militant and challenging was his direction for developing a mass movement of blacks, that no one could stop him—from President Wilson, who called him "the most dangerous man in the U.S."

to the Joint Legislative Committee Investigating Sedition Activities that smothered and perverted him.

What provided all the anti-black and anti-Black months of the Government was the fact that Randolph's The Messenger fought not only Big Business but the Government and, not only any specific administration but the very notion of the United States itself. The Masons, by printing a cartoon of a black man being lynched, wrapped in an American flag set an example.

Nord did he let the labor bureaucracy get away with its type of routine operation of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, and organized the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, and minority won labor victories from against the railroad magnates but then started fighting within the AFL against its bureaucracy. As late as 1961, there was a confrontation between him, as the only black on the Executive Committee, and Meany. So telling was Randolph's criticism, that Meany exploded, "Who the hell appointed you as spokesman for the black movement?"

Although, at the outbreak of World War II, A. Philip Randolph was no longer a socialist, he was still an activist, and once again broke new ground, this time as President of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, by organizing a March on Washington (MOW). He had planned to mobilize no less than 100,000 black workers to protest the new unemployment.

The so frightened President Roosevelt that he issued Executive Order 8802 to bar discrimination in war industries. While this small version of the Fair Employment Practices Act did stop the March, it did not stop Randolph from then transforming his March committee into a committee to end Jim Crow in the Army (See: The March on Washington Movement's pamphlet, The War's Greatest Scandal! The Story of Jim Crow in Uniform.)

This still didn't take his magnificent history-making actions. As against the beginning of the war, when their slogan was "The Yanks are not coming," the American Communists made a 180-degree turn when the Hitler-Stalin Pact collapsed as Germany attacked Russia, and could the most rabid containment in flag-waving, pretentious patriotism. The CFJ turned against the MOW, then attacked the Committee against Jim Crow, calling for "a second front," to be opened by the U.S. everywhere, except, of course, in the U.S., for Black freedom, or for the right of workers to strike.

They demanded, instead, that the Negro subordinate his struggles to "the fight against Fascism" in Germany. They called A. Philip Randolph a veritable subversive and his movement too belligerent. The Communist Party's vice-presidential candidate had the gall to say that Randolph's movements helped to "create confusion and dangerous mood in the ranks of the Negro people and utilizing their justified grievances as a weapon of opposition to the Administration's war program . . . ."

THE GROUND FOR TODAY

This did, in fact, stop Randolph and he did win the end of Jim Crow in the Army. Nor did he limit his contributions to the economic and social sphere, or to America alone. He was instrumental in helping to establish the two-way road between Africa and America that has become a hallmark of the black fight for freedom.

To honor A. Philip Randolph is not just a matter of remembrance of things past but only of clearing his legacy from the deliberate misinterpretation by those—including the press—that bears his name and that is headed by Norman Hill—who want the public to know only his last years. Rather, it is to build today and tomorrow on the ground he laid as a pioneer of the organization of black labor and a pioneer of unifying black with socialism in the battle of ideas.
Herbert Marcuse, Marxist philosopher

The death of Herbert Marcuse on July 30 marks a sad day on the historic calendar of young revolutionaries as well as old Marxists. How great is the void his death has created can be gauged from his mature life stage which covered the 1919 German Revolution, the U.S. New Left in the mid-1960s, to the very month of his death in Germany — the country of his birth, the land of both Hegel and Marx — where he was preparing a paper on “The Holocaust” to be delivered both there and in Spain. Marcuse’s life-work was by no means one upward spiral. But the fact that the mass media, in their obituary, chose to dwell on his One-Dimensional Man, as if that were the focal point of his life, tells a great deal more about decadent capitalism than it does about Herbert Marcuse.

The truth is that, as a young man completing his military service in Germany, he was active in the revolutionary Students’ Council in Berlin. Marx’s philosophy of liberation and the revolutionaries, Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, were the real determinants of Marcuse’s life. It is true that when the Social Democracy betrayed that 1919 revolution and Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht were murdered, Marcuse left political activism for the study of philosophy. It is not true that he wavered in his commitment to Marxism.

In the very period when he wrote his first major work, Hegel’s Ontology and the Foundation of a Theory of History, which still bears the traces of his teacher, Heidegger, he penned what remains in this day one of the most profound analyses of Marx’s Economic Philosophers, 1844, which had just then (1923) been published in Germany. Not only does Marcuse there call Marx’s early essays the “philosophical foundation of a theory of revolution,” but he adds prophetically for our times:

“All attempts to diminish the philosophical content of Marx’s theory or to gloss over it in embarrassment reveal a complete failure to recognize the historical origin of the theory; they set out from an essential separation of philosophy, economics and revolutionary praxis, which is a product of the reaction against which Marx fought and which he had already overcome at the beginning of his critique.” (p. 10)

JUST AS THE BOURGEOIS REVOLUTION is trying to reduce the historic legacy of Marcuse to the writing of One-Dimensional Man (to which I’ll return later), so the Stalinists and Maoists did everything to slander Marcuse in the 1960s when, by no means a youth, he was identified with the New Left in the anti-Vietnam War movement, in the Black Revolution, in the student movement...

... (Continued on Page 7)
Herman Marceus, Marxist philosopher

(Continued from Page 11)

ment which led to a climax in May 1969, in Paris.

What these international intellectuals, calling
themselves "Marxists," don't explain is why they chose to
"expose" themselves to the so-called "exposure of
Marxist's role" for the U.S. Government! two
decades earlier, in World War II. What they hide is
that while Marceus, even then, did not completely renounce
Marxism as theory, they did totally revise Marxism both in
theory and in practice. The reason is two-fold:

First, by the 1960s, different reasons, both Russia
and China, refused to approve any but their own method
of opposing U.S. imperialism -- that is, actually
carrying out secret negotiations with it to make
sure there would be no successful social revolution in
their own lands. Second, Stalinists and Maoists alike
had to make the "exposure" of Marxist ideas nonsense that
one would want to look at what Marceus had published in
that crucial year of 1941.

That was the year Reunion and Revolution
appeared. In that seminal work, Marceus established the
Humanism of Marxism, and re-established the revolutionary
dynastic of Hegel-Marx, for the first time for the American
public. It is impossible to forget it. Its inescapability we
felt for Marceus when that breath of fresh air and vision
of a truly classless society was published -- and we were
actively opposing that imperial war. It was the year
I embarked on the study of the nature of the Russian
economy and the role of labor in that state-planned
economy, and came upon Marx's Humanist Essays and
the famous Frankfurt School. While I deeply disagreed
with these German refugees who were under the illusion
that one way of driving Nazism was to work for the U.S.
government, I felt a kinship to their opponents of
Naziism. One thing that distinguished Herbert Marceus, a
theorist in that famous Frankfurt School, officially
affiliated to Social Democracy, was that he did not hold
himself apart from the people in the country in which he
lived. He and his friends were not the rulers, but the
revolutionaries.

THUS AT THE HEIGHT of McCarthyism, when the
Humanism of Marxism about which I was writing in
Marceus and Laden's, "Marxism as well as its
world dimension," was hardly the most popular
thing to do in those United States, Marceus volunteered,
when I sent him the manuscript, to write the Preface to it.105 He also tried to find a publisher for it. In
private, as a publicist, did we ever hide the sharp
differences that divided us. But that did not keep
him from praising his own belief in a continuous
up, serious battle of ideas as more than mere bourgeois
democracy. As he put it in that Preface:

"The Marxist insistence on democracy as the
preparatory stage to socialism, the one that is being
written, is a natural stage. The theory in which
the humanism was to carry on the work of
Marxism was the revolution
forty force, but bestowed that revolutionary role on art.
Here is what he wrote would be my epitaph: "You
will laugh, when you hear that I am working on Marxist
anthropology: 'Don't he cry, other worlds?" But perhaps

105 In private, as a publicist, did we ever hide the sharp
differences that divided us. But that did not keep
him from praising his own belief in a continuous
up, serious battle of ideas as more than mere bourgeois
democracy. As he put it in that Preface:

"The Marxist insistence on democracy as the
preparatory stage to socialism, the one that is being
written, is a natural stage. The theory in which
the humanism was to carry on the work of
Marxism was the revolution
forty force, but bestowed that revolutionary role on art.
Here is what he wrote would be my epitaph: "You
will laugh, when you hear that I am working on Marxist
anthropology: 'Don't he cry, other worlds?" But perhaps

105 In private, as a publicist, did we ever hide the sharp
differences that divided us. But that did not keep
him from praising his own belief in a continuous
up, serious battle of ideas as more than mere bourgeois
democracy. As he put it in that Preface:

"The Marxist insistence on democracy as the
preparatory stage to socialism, the one that is being
written, is a natural stage. The theory in which
the humanism was to carry on the work of
Marxism was the revolution
forty force, but bestowed that revolutionary role on art.
Here is what he wrote would be my epitaph: "You
will laugh, when you hear that I am working on Marxist
anthropology: 'Don't he cry, other worlds?" But perhaps

THE DETERMINING DIVISION between us, of
course, came in 1962, with the publication of One-Dimen-
sional Man. All this was the Marxist concept of labor as
the revolutionary force and reason for transforming so-
 ciety, which Marceus had held not only in his 1933 essay
on Marx but also in his 1942 Reunion and Revolution,
and as a departure for development if you wish of the 1937
Preface to Marxism and Freedom. When Marceus began
questioning the role of the proletariat, he now pro-
ounced nothing short of capitalist's "integration" of the
working class in mind as well as body and -- over, a
La Draper's analysis of unification, in fact, is only half
the truth, that, for from the proletariat having become
one-dimensional, the intellectual workers who does not see proletariat, is that the "exposure" is one-
dimensional. I went into my own work, and when most we
not, what happened means that great is the philosopher
void that his death brings and how hard it will be to

He laughed at my "review"106 and called me a "na-
ive." Those gentle eyes of his a way of talking even when he was theoretically shutting you at you as if he was saying: "It really is good to have one who still be-
lieves, for, without revolution, what is there?"

This was the attitude I could not accept. Why he suddenly
engaged me in a discussion of a phrase Marx used in his
Critique of the Gotha Program: "labor, from a more
means of life, has become the prime necessity of life."
When he asked what I thought that meant, it needed only
be pointed out that Marx knew very well what Marx
meant. He wasn't asking for any sort of definition about
how different from alienated labor under capitalism
would be labor as self-activity and self-development when
with the abolition of the distinction between mental and
physical labor," the new society could write its banner:
"From each according to his ability, to each according
to his need."

No, what he was saying was since we "named know-
ly labor will become creative as unified mental-physi-
al, any more than we can know when the state will
"with no hurry" and we are merely living in a "repro-
ducer society," he it the U.S. or Russia--what can we, "a very
thing minority," do? If you think it is more than the Great
Reform -- well!
MARXISM ALWAYS HAD a strong streak of pessimism in him. I don't mean pessimism in any "psychological" sense — he enjoyed life too much for that. I mean this constant veering between loving utopias and not believing in them; some sort of cloud was always appearing at the very moment when he thought he saw farthest. Ah, there goes that smile on those gentle eyes. Oh, no, he is dead!

One final personal word. Last year when I saw him in California, where I was on a lecture tour, we of course disagreed again; and again it was on the nearness or distance of revolution. Suddenly he asked me why I didn't stop "running around." (That is, being active), and concentrate instead on finishing the manuscript on Rosa Luxemburg and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution.

When the news of Marx's death came this July 20, just 10 days after his 51st birthday, and I remembered the last discussion, I thought: the 1919 German Revolution and Marx's philosophy of liberation were precursors to the birth of Herbert Marrese as Marxist-philosopher. How sad that he is gone! How great that the revolutionary legacy lives on.

Detroit - Maya Danzyasvhaya
Aug. 3, 1979

A review of 'The Letters of Rosa Luxemburg'

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION and Marxism and Freedom


The multi-dimensionality and revolutionary internationalism of Rosa Luxemburg is well set forth in this collection of her Letters in the way in which she always said things in a way which the very first sentence of Bronner's Introduction leads to this statement: "I, too, am a land of boundless possibilities." That first section of "Reflections on Rosa Luxemburg" begins with "The desolation of liberalism that stands in opposition to the heritage that a given society preserves and propogates."

"It is this other tradition—revolutionary in the most total sense, that is to say, in opposition to capitalism and the reformist deviations within the revolutionary movement—that would have been easier to grasp if the readers had not to confront letters from 1894 to 1919 in one lump sum without a single distinction other than the year's date at the top of each page. It is true that Professor Bronner's substantive Introduction situates Luxemburg in the context of her era. But it is only natural that readers turning to The Letters of Rosa Luxemburg would want to hear her in her own words and some direction of her thoughts, actions, development before they have reached the 200th page of these letters."

"HEROISM OF MASSES VS. OPPORTUNISM OF LEADERS" (pp. 29-37)

Because this book needs to be read by ever wider audiences, let me introduce two divisions into these Letters to enable readers at once to meet Rosa Luxemburg—Polish, German, Russian, international revolutionary. The first half of the Letters could be titled: "Polish, German, Russian, International Revolutionary."

Also, and second half: "From Theory and Anti-War Agitation to Prison and Revolution."

It is true she used the expression, "heroism of the masses," to describe the magnificent actions of the Warsaw workers in the first Russian Revolution, 1905, whereas this collection of letters begins in 1894, with a letter of Luxemburg to her collaborator, Leo Jogiches, in which she complains that his letters are wholly devoted to the "cause" and tell nothing of his personalty or the organizational and factional differences with the Russians. It is even more true that, from the very start of her break with bourgeois society—when she was only a teenager, yet was already under police surveillance and had to leave Poland for Switzerland, where she met her lifelong collaborator Jogiches—"the heroism of the masses" was precisely what won her commitment to the revolutionary movement. She never veered from that for a single moment.

However, whereas that 1894 letter from Pilsen spoke with particularity and yet with nearly "obliquely", all one has to do is read the very next set of letters, as she reached Germany in 1905, to see a quite different Luxemburg. Not "by does she take issue with Jogiches' advice, but she requests such immediate insights theoretically on the most burning question raging in the German Social Democracy—the very first appearance of realism—that it is her analysis, Reform or Revolution, that is the most comprehensive and profound answer to Bernstein. It becomes a standard for all revolutionaries, and has remained so to this day.
sensed his opportunism which would lead to betrayal. She called it "the sorrows of the theoretician" back in 1910. Just as her total break with Kautsky, four years before the outbreak of war, long before anyone else, Lenin included, sensed any defect in the then most outstanding revolutionary, so her sudden agitation in 1913 led the Kaiser to exile her "for treason" before there was actual war.

Prefer, Breuer has caught the character of RosaLuxemburg as prisoner sensitively: "It is easy to forget how dull and drabilitating prison life can actually be.
Rosa Luxemburg's letters serve as a reminder... Rosa Luxemburg renews against the drudgery of prison life... She searches for beauty in the debris of existence, and in response to the inner voice of isolation, she watches insects, feeds her "ladies", and observes the manifold diversity of nature."

That was very far from all she did in that hellhole. Not only did she continue her leadership, theoretical and political, of the anti-imperialist, but also produce a minor masterpiece of literary criticism of Kautsky (not to mention the constant flow of magnificent 'personal' letters, especially to Madame Worr, when she suddenly calls upon Politzhina, the queen of the Anarchists). No, she is also involved in strict theory, the phenomenal Anti-Critique, directed against the critics of her greatest theoretical work, Accumulation Capital: they are, in fact, a single work.

Unfortunately, as her letter to Rosa Liebknecht disclosed, her rage was directed not alone against these, but also against, among others, the famous first volume of Marx's Capital, with its profligate treacly ornamentation in the Hegelian style." (p. 385).

None of this, however, diverted her in any way from what dominated her whole life, to them, or to practice, in or out of prison: REVOLUTION. Even in criticism, for example, her praise of the Bolshoie Revolution and the Bolsheviks under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky who dared was unequivocal. Above all, there was the unending preparation for, and finally actual participation in, the German Revolution which finally freed her from prison. Revolution was her life—on, as she expressed it: "The Revolution is magnificent; all else is sieve"—she then ruled Social Democracy wanted her dead. Where the Kaiser had succeeded, the Freikorps was helped to brutally murder her and throw her body into the Landwehr Canal.

The Letters of Rosa Luxemburg ends with a letter in which she enclosed the first issue of Rose Fuhr, organ of Spectators League, transformed into the Communist Party, and calling for all power to the Workers' and Soldiers' Commissars. It was dated January 4, 1919. Within 11 days she was dead. But they could not kill her ideas. Her revolutionary legacy lives on; for no other generation does her life's work bear so much relevance as for ours.

"The designation "greatest" means it is Luxemburg's most important theoretical work, not that I agree with it. Elsewhere I have taken issue with it. See my "Analysis of Rosa Luxemburg's Accumulation of Capital", included as Appendix to State-Capitalism and Marx's Humanism, available from News & Letters for 50c plus postage.
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Two Worlds

ON THE THRESHOLD OF THE 1980s

The following excerpts are taken from the Perspectives Theses delivered at a National Editorial Board Meeting of New and Letters Committees on Sept. 1 in Detroit. The full report is now available from ISL (see ref, p. 6, for table of contents).

by Raya Dunayevskaya
National Chairmaness, New and Letters Committees

1. THE OVERVIEW: NEW BEGINNINGS VS. DECLINING CAPITALISM IN DISORDER

The decade of the 1970s is ending with the capitalist world order in total disorder. When the 1973 Arab-Israeli war led to the 1974 quadrupling of oil prices, it destroyed upon U.S. imperialism, which already had been creating because of its imperialist war in Vietnam. The Johnson administration's "guns and butter" refused to acknowledge that not only the armed might but the economy had been deprived. The truth is that the economy had sustained hardly bearable gains in its very structure—so, if you wish, nature. This year it has become impossible for the capitalists and their ideologues to predict any sort of boom, no matter how hard they try to play down the recession we're in as "mild," with their computerized gimmicks playing the "future's" game. Nor can U.S. imperialism saddle "obligation"—OPEC, or Andrew Young—with the myriad political crises it is causing every day.

Quite the contrary, the political crises, like the economic crises, seem from this decaying capitalist-imperialist world system, with its two nuclear Titans—U.S. and Russia—fighting for single world rule. No matter how hard rulers pretend, with SALT I and SALT II, that they will allow the armaments race, the goal is so clearly preparation for the unbridgeable world holocaust that even so thoroughly a paper as the New York Times, which is for SALT II, calls the present-day editor, "Arms Control Out of Control" (8/15/79).

If anyone needed any further proof of capitalist disarray, what a good indication to look at what happened last month at the last summit, as the technologically most advanced nations of the Western alliance and Japan—arrived at a "consensus" and predetermined to act in common against OPEC's economic boycott in prices. Each went on its own way to try to conclude a separate deal with the oil producers, including their opportunistic embrace of the U.S. and Andrew Young, the espoused for that attempted shift in global politics can hardly convince a cold—cruel Israel is no cold—cruel—that Young acted alone.

After all, before Camp David, long before, Carter—Vance even tried an official deal alone both with Israel and the PLO.

Not to be discounted is its reification in the attitude of black leaders (with which we will dwell later). Here what needs to be stressed is the timing: that it takes place after Camp David, after the actual signing of the so-called "Campbell Peace Treaty," and after Sadat declared himself all too eager to also fill the Shah's role and in the U.S.'s policeman in the Middle East. What this signifies is an admission of failure of the Camp David negotiations. What is new is the abysmal depth of the totality not only of the global economic-political crises, but the proliferation of A-bomb knowledge in the bawdyrooms as well as the Atlantic-Pacific-Oil's preserves; witness Pakistan aiming for "a hydrogen bomb"...
October, 1979

The significance of their meeting is not the alleged united anti-Israeli躺在床上 action, actually the SCLC that had met with the PLO and rejected Israel's designation of it as "terrorist", while they, as Rev. Lowery put it, "put no conditions" to their proposal to the PLO to "take consideration" to "reorganizing the coalition of Israel", did not find that position shared by many of the others.

No, what brought some cohesion was precisely the revolutionary nature of the Black dimension, even when it is middle-class. What is pivotal is the fact that they criticized not alone Israel, but the backward move that the middle-class Jews are making, in the function of both quasis and so-called reverse discrimination—all the banks and Western corporations which, during the time the coalition of civil rights came by many whites. Indeed, if you look at all the glories of the so-called "New Philosophy" and at Raymond Aron's In Defense of Decadent Europe in France, you will see that the Decadence bourgeois system of ideas in the United States is not "one of the most important intellectual statements of our time." So pervasive is this so-called "New Philosophy" that it challenges the Left, too. But it is impossible to destroy those non-conservative and reformist positions without a philosophy of liberalism—Marxist-Humanism—which does not separate itself from the revolution itself.

---

III. OBJECTIVE SIGNIFICANCE OF "SUBJECTIVE" RESOLUTIONS: THE 1965 DEADLINE—THE MILESTONE WORLD HISTORIC EVENTS OF OUR DECADE—TO DEVELOP INSTEAD OF TO ABORT

Without a philosophy of revolution, that is to say, a total outline of the explosive capitalism, racist, sexist, decadent system, there is no way for new beginnings to develop. In order, therefore, to bring the task of concrete and deepening Marx's philosophy of revolution over to our hands, we set in 1965 the "deadline for Rosa Luxemburg, Today's Women's Liberation Movement, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution.

Let us look into the future developments in the book which will cost further illustration on that point.

---

"As we were warned the white "New Left" in the 1960's was a hindrance to the Black dimension, as we wrote of the leadership of the First Black Convention that, by failing to look where the global Stima- Marta Masses and the New Left were in that direction, they were, in fact, like the white "New Left" of the 1960's, too much concerned with leadership, leadership, leadership, and paying no attention to the Black masses. It is not "leadership" or Party that is the way we admired then and now; the Black masses are vanguard.

In passing four resolutions: 1) In support of the Arab Nasser; 2) In support of the Arab Nasser; 3) In support of the Arab Nasser; 4) In support of the Arab Nasser. Each of these resolutions was to have a dialogue with the PLO, and above all, in separating themselves from some Jewish so-called friends who had, in fact, reorganized on civil rights in both the Black Nasser and the PLO and had suddenly recalled 1972. Unfortunately, it was only for purposes of contrasting the logic of unity in 1972 to the Black Nasser in 1972, and contrasting themselves against the "kids in the darkside (who) were always talking about unity in the 60's and never achieved it." Beyond atoms the unity a positive "miracles"."
The notion is imperative to study the 18th Bre-
marle, parallel with the study of the 1848 Re-
volution. It is that Marx's theory of proletarian revolu-
tion was brought into the work of the own brothe Marx always
used the highest point of revolution as his point of de-
parture, even when he was analyzing a counter-revolu-
tion. And it is in the 18th Bremaer that he contrived
proletarian revolution to bourgeois because the former step to criticize themselves, instead of rushing uncri-
sculously ahead. As against bourgeois revolutions, wrote
Marx: "Proletarian revolutions...crisis constantly,
interrupt themselves constantly, interrupt themselves
continually in their own course, decide with un-
merciful thoroughness the inequalities, weaknesses and
palpitations of their first attempts...revolt once from
the indefinite prodigies of their own sinus, until a
situation has been created which makes all turning back
impossible, and the conditions themselves cry out: He
Rhodos, be salt!"

Now we come to the second point which I said was,
I can't, primary, as we anticipate the new book. The
most critical and greatest achievement of the proletariat
in Marx's day in the very first proletarian revolution
ever—the Paris Commune—went hand in hand with a
historic new achievement in thought as Marx analyzed
it in The Civil War in France, in "writings," as as
some brutal Marx called Lenin's State and Revolution.
It told the philosophic foundation for nothing short of the
November 1917 Russian Revolution. It is such a
"writings" for our day which is necessary for the
American-revolution-to-be.

But even in Marx's day there was no direct road
from it. Both as actual revolution and as revolution in
cognition, to the next revolution. Quite the contrary.
Though for Marx, it was at once made integral to his
greatest (theoretical) work, Capital, as it was amended
in the 1958 French edition, that same year those who
considered themselves Marxists in Germany—the Erz-
achts—were uniting with the Lassalleans to form a
united program at Gotha where they penned their new
"program."

Marc's Critique of the Goffa Programme has yet to
be analyzed in as thorough—mean thoroughly creat-
ine—a form as Lenin did of Marx's Civil War in France.
Marc's Critique of the Goffa Programme is as his
works are critiques—it never just a critique, an oppo-
sition, but is always projecting the absolute opposite
in an affirmative way—seizing the future in the present
class society. Therefore, Marx projects the absolute trans-
formation of labor from what it is under capitalism as a
value-creating process to what the very activity of laboring
becomes when it is not just a "means" of
creating surplus value for the exploiter. It becomes the
"first necessity of life" because it is then both Force
and Reason as one, mentally and physically, thus creat-
ing a new Man/Woman in a classless society.

Marc's Critique of the Goffa Programme has yet to
be analyzed in as thorough—mean thoroughly creat-
ine—a form as Lenin did of Marx's Civil War in France.
Marc's Critique of the Goffa Programme is as his
works are critiques—it never just a critique, an oppo-
sition, but is always projecting the absolute opposite
in an affirmative way—seizing the future in the present
class society. Therefore, Marx projects the absolute trans-
formation of labor from what it is under capitalism as a
value-creating process to what the very activity of laboring
becomes when it is not just a "means" of
creating surplus value for the exploiter. It becomes the
"first necessity of life" because it is then both Force
and Reason as one, mentally and physically, thus creat-
ing a new Man/Woman in a classless society.

And yet, and yet, so anxious was Marx not to stop
the formation of a "united organization" because it was
a movement, that he did not make this criticism public.
It remained in a letter to the Marxist leaders. And even
as those leaders finally created, after Marx's death, a
fully Marxist party, at Erfurt more than a decade later, they
resisted Engels' wishes to have it published as critical
to any "Erfurt Program." It is true that Engels' relentless
fighting to get it published did finally
succeed. But was it grasped philosophically as well as
organizationally when Lassalleans were nowhere around.

The subjective assigning of the deadline flows
from the objective, the objectively new, that arose in
the mid-1950s. So, allow me to stress that the most
important political, for example, gave birth to a totally
new category—party/-democracy—which has something
to tell us, some indication of a road to follow, though they
themselves seem not to follow while we have been
beating our chests, and independent one after one in
breaking through on the Absolute Idea as a movement
from practice as well as from theory. We must renew the
old not only as theory, but also in practice, organizationally as well, as News and Letters Commit-
ate that sharply opposed "the party to keep" without
turning away from an organizational expression of the
philosophy of Marx's brilliantly reconstituted form.

Look even at the Nicaraguan Revolution, where the
revolutionaries did come from guerrilla struggle and
you see there was a sharp departure from both "good-l"n
and "Lender Maximus." There is a new danger of
courage—Popular Frontism, i.e., class collaboration.
And there is no way of telling to what extent Nicaragua
will be held back by the sting of U.S. imperialism at-
taches to any aid. But they have started something new,
very new. Not only is it the first revolution in Latin
America since Cuba's 20 years ago, but it has interna-
tional relations that are by no means limited to Eu-
pria, as was Cuba's. The something new is in being both
urban and peasant; in always challenging the seat of
power; like occupying the Parliament building instead
of individual murder and terrorism, which solves abso-
relatively nothing.

The point of all this is: we must not allow the new
beginnings to either away, or short. No, the task of
Marxist revolutionaries is to conciliate Marx's philoso-
phy of revolution, where it itself, becomes force for
revolution.

This is our task for the 1980s.
LEON TROTSKY: A CRITIQUE

by Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION and Man and Freedom

EDITOR'S NOTE: On this hundredth anniversary of Leon Trotsky's birth, we are printing brief excerpts from a new Political-Philosophical Letter by Raya Dunayevskaya, "The Two Russian Revolutions, and Once Again, on the Theory of Permanent Revolution." The full letter is available from News & Letters for $5.40, postage included.

Dear Reader,

... The Revolutions of 1905 and 1917 have forever enshrined Trotsky's great historical role. The same two revolutions, however, tell a very contradictory story about the theory with which Trotsky's name will likewise always be connected as he is the creator of the 20th century version of the theory of the Permanent Revolution. The expression, "contradictory story," is not a reference to the critiques of that theory, mine included.

Recently, in re-reading the 1905-07 Revolution as turning point in Russia, Luxemburg's life, the 1907 Lenin Congress of the Russian Social-Democrat Labor Party (in Russian abbreviated RSDRP; in English, RSDLP) became crucial, not just in regard to her views, but to those of Lenin and Trotsky—and, for that matter, all other tendencies in Russia, as it was that unified Congress of Bolsheviks and Mensheviks that, for once, all tendencies attended.

Lenin began at the beginning, with Trotsky's participation in that 1907 Congress which revolved around the 1905 Revolution. Lenin remembered that this occurred after Trotsky had reached the highest point of activity with the General Strike led by the St. Petersburg Soviet, which he headed. Not only was that a high point of revolution, it became the highest point of Trotsky's theoretical development, as he wrote in 1907: "It was at this point that the term 'permanent revolution' was first used by Trotsky in his 'Outline of a Program for the Revolutionary Proletariat,' which Marx had developed in his 1853 Address to the Communist League—was the issue in dispute.

... IT IS TROTSKY'S original projection, which was later to become known as the theory of Permanent Revolution, but which was not on the agenda of that 1907 Congress because Lenin's proposal to discuss "The Present Moment of Revolution" was defeated by the Mensheviks—with Trotsky's help. Here is what Trotsky said in that dispute:

"What I want is that the Congress, from beginning to end, be political, that it be a gathering of revolutionary representatives of the Party, and not a club, be it of doubt or of even non-doubtful factions, bent on general discussion. I need political directives, and not general philosophical deliberations about the character of the present moment of our revolution... Give us a formula for action! That's what I need."

When the Congress got down to discussing the one "general," i.e., the real question—the relationship of Social-Democracy to Bourgeoisie... Trotsky did not present a revolution different from that of the Bolsheviks presented, though he did say that indeed, he reproached his own party in the 1923 edition of 1905 precisely to show that he opposed the Mensheviks and voted with the Bolsheviks. Yet in the years immediately following the Congress he wrote a whole series of articles attacking the Bolsheviks as well as the Mensheviks. The major one (and the one he was proud enough to reproduce in the 1925 edition of his book) was the article entitled "Our Differences" that had been published in Luxemburg's paper in 1909. Here is how it concluded:

... while the anti-revolutionary aspects of Menshevism have already become fully apparent, those of Bolsheviks are likely to become a serious threat only in the event of victory." (1905, Volumes V, p. 305.)

As if that were not a fantastic enough statement to make in 1908 in "predicting" the future revolution, Trotsky in 1909... that is to say, only a few years after that Lein had led the greatest revolution in history—exquisitely forecasted the 1908 statement as follows:

"Note to the present edition. This threat, as we know, never materialized, because under the leadership of Comrade Lenin, the Bolsheviks changed their policy line on this most important matter (not without inner struggles) in the spring of 1917, that is, before the advent of power. (Author.)

(1905, p. 317 fn. 1)

THE POINT I.A., what happened in those intervening 12 years between 1905 and 1917? As we already saw, in 1907 he did not wish to discuss the outcome of the present moment of the revolution. In 1909 he published the above cited criticism of Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, in 1920 he followed it up with an article in Neue Zeit, where the first point Trotsky made was:

"Theory must replace experience."

As if 1905 meant, not the greatest experience ever for him but the Russian external and domestic, as well as for the world working class—but only

*"Die konzeptionelle Grundlage der revolutionären Staatstheorie" from Leon Trotsky, News & Letters 10, Vol. 2, Dec. 9, 1945, p. 95 (for the address)."
That, in part, is true but the whole truth is that it was not the theory of Permanent Revolution but "reform" that destroyed the Party, but Lenin's famous April Theses. To understand the crisis, one must refer to Lenin's conversion to Trotsky's theory. The May Theses, a theoretical catastrophe, was a direct result of his ideological confusion. The need for a new revolution and the theory of permanent revolution were formulated by Trotsky. The May Theses were a continuation of the same line. The need for a new revolution was a direct result of the failure of the October Revolution and the conditions of the new period.
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Grave contradictions in the Iranian revolution

by Naya Dunayevskaya

Author of *Soviets and Revolution* and *Marxism and Freedom*

(News and Letters Committee has received the following letter from Raya Dunayevskaya, who is very working on her new book-in-progress—Ed.)

Nov. 27, 1979

Dear Ylenas,

I would like to comment on the Iranian Revolution that was—oral and may still resume and deepen, as it is by no means over, despite the counter-revolutionary moves being carried out by the Iranian demagogues, Khomeini, whose illusions are being marred by Carter’s saber-rattling. This would be the time for saying one thing and one thing only: “A plague on both your houses.”

I. WHERE TO NOW?

Because, however, of the memory of some of the Iranian Revolution as it overthrew the Shah’s barbarous regime backed by U.S. imperialism, because of the remembrance of Women’s Liberation’s refusal to wear the chador, challenging Khomeini’s attempt to turn the clock backward and reduce women to a feudalistic state and because of the continuing rebellion of the shirkels, as well as the Arab oil workers in Iranian against Khomeini, along with the other minorities struggles for self-determination—it is necessary to take a second look at the new form of the occult which is coming out of Khomeini’s Iran and calling all others, and not only U.S. imperialism, “muzzled” by “God” (“the corrupt of the earth”). It is imperative to practice duality, rather than to act on first reaction, as that tantamount Khomeini’s opposition to the U.S. is genuine opposition to American imperialism.

Of course the hatred of the Iranian people for such that hatred, for the Shah, and their opposition to U.S. imperialism, which had put him in power and kept him there, is not only real and justified for Iranians, but was real and justified for the many Americans who both expressed the truth of the Shah’s torture of the people and witnessed their popularly against Iranian revolutionaries. Of course the Carter Administration was well aware of the opposition not only in Iran but in this country to granting any asylum to the Shah, and for a while—very short while—the Carter was forced to resist the pressures of Nixon, Kissinger and David Rockefeller’s Chase Manhattan Bank to bring the Shah to the U.S. But following the line of that new Fidel, Khomeini, against “infidels” and “Islamic domination” is anything but struggling against U.S. imperialism or showing solidarity with the Iranian revolutionaries.

ALL: ONE should do to see the degeneration of the so-called Revolutionary Council in Iran is to see the new “cover” given by the current acting foreign secretary, Bagheri, who is trying to institute an Iranian version of Pol Pot. Listen to the interview of Khomeini’s aide to Eric Boulle in La Monde (November 10): “Tehran is a monstrous parenthesis, which absorbs by itself one-half of the national consciousness, we will empty it of some of its people by creating the countryside industrial and agricultural production units.”

Unfortunately, even the more recognisable Left—Trotskyists—for practicing any revolutionary discipline, is busy following Khomeini’s Iran. The Intercontinental Press (IP) of 11-23-79 and 11-25-79 keeps talking of a “New Uproar in the Iranian Revolution”.

It even sees anti-U.S. imperialism in Khomeini’s phrase “Islamic domination” in the arrogant message Khomeini sent to the equally arrogant Pope, telling the latter that the way the “Christian world (can) redeem itself” is by following Islamic Iran’s fight against “infidels”.

It is impossible not to ask whether there isn’t a coincidence between this and the one imperialist gesture by Khomeini which allowed some of the banned papers to appear, including Kadar (Warriors), the paper of the Iranian Socialist Workers Party (ISWP). In any case, the very first issue, 11-17-79, of Kadar reappeared cited Khomeini’s statement to the Pope as proof of “how anti-imperialism” Khomeini was. Furthermore, continued IP, the holding of American hostages by the Iranian students (who, not so incidentally, call themselves “followers of the Imam”) “re-emphasises the people’s historic demand for political and economic independence from world imperialism.”

In what pretension revolution, exactly, was the “taking of hostages” and not the rulers, but some fairly low Khadafi-type send to be a revolutionary tactic? Since when has war and revolution been made synonymous? Isn’t it about time that Marxist-revolutionaries labeled Khomeini’s endless repetition of “we are not of war” “looking forward to martyrdom” for what it is, by citing Marx who wrote that Napoleon, the ultimate counter-revolutionary, “subordinated permanent war for permanent revolution”?

IN IRAN TODAY we have a demagogue, openly lying that “U.S. imperialism and its corrupt enemy, Israel” were involved in the occupation of the Grand Mosque in Mecca, while some of the Iranian Muslims are infidels—menial to permit to enter. Isn’t he repeating his schemes even after his fellow Ayatollahs, the Savi Abol-Mahdies, not only deposed any U.S. and/or Israel involvement, but showed that he set the pagotage against them by a clear act of the Islam of the Muslims who lead him, himself, to be the Messiah. Even then Khomeini proceeded to stress the Big Lie’s impact by expressing “great joy” at the fact that the U.S. Embassy in Pakistan had been put to the torch and two Americans killed.

But the Trotskyists continue with their fairly tale Leninism, since they do support Khomeini and look forward to the downfall of the Shah, who is involved in the oil question.
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Grave contradictions in the Iranian revolution

by H.R. Radcliffe

Author of *Philosophy*

and *The Mind of the Modern Mindless"

Dear Friends,

In the more recognizable Left—

the anti-communist, anti-revolutionary
democratic Iran is on the rise.

They seem to be following a
dead-end path, but that's not necessarily the case.

The Shah's regime was suppressed in 1979, and

the new Islamic Republic of Iran has been

struggling to find its footing.

The contradictions are evident:

on the one hand, there's a desire for

progress and modernization,

and on the other hand, a strong

attachment to tradition and

Islam.

This is a complex situation,

and it's important to understand

the different perspectives and

interests at play.

Best regards,

H.R. Radcliffe

December, 1979

And in Iran, itself, the so-called Revolutionary Council is itself faction-ridden with pro-Libyan, pro-Syrian, pro-Islamic factions; and though they each bow to Khomeini now, it doesn’t mean that would hold if other Muslim countries act out their discontents. At the same time, Moscow of Iran has no intention whatever of bowing to Khomeini. Indeed, he has already once threatened an invasion and, is at the moment, arming some Kurds to start a revolt within Iran.

III. THE MAILED FIST OF U.S. IMPERIALISM

And what, exactly, is being prepared for the Iranian people once this month of mourning, the hecubaism, is over? Well, they are to engage in a referendum to approve the Draft Constitution which the Ayatollahs Montazeri and Bani hashim have drawn up. Anyone who has any illusions that this Constitution bears any resemblance whatever to the one that was inspired by the First Russian Revolution of 1905-1907, when the first Shah was overthrown, or even as the Mullahs amended that Constitution when they brought the Shah back, should take a look at the new instruction of the Office of Religious Guardian which has the right not to veto over everything and anything passed by the state rulers and is also the supreme commander of the armed forces.

The point is that the Constitution does nothing but try to legitimise Khomenei’s usurpation of the victory of the workers who achieved the actual overthrow of the Shah. It cannot solve the crisis in Iran, anymore than staged demonstrations before the U.S. Embassy and the solicitation use of hostages can stay the hand of U.S. Imperialism.

---

(2) Christian Science Monitor, 11-21-79.
THE GREATEST danger now lies in the momentum gained by Khomeini’s demagoguery, which might trigger Apocalypse Now! That is the lesson at which the world now stands. Khomeini and Carter may not fight as they prepare for such a confrontation, but the world must do everything to stay the hands of both rulers.

In the imperative struggle against the savage racism in this country against Iranian students, we must never forget that the underlying racism that has always been shown against the Blacks has actually been diverted also against revolutionaries and minorities, though in depth it has been differently expressed racially. What I am saying is that not only must we remember the horror of U.S. concentration camps against Japanese-Americans during World War II, at the very time when no such atrocities were committed against Nazis in this country. The case against each while fascist was treated as an individual case. We must remember the fact that American revolutionaries have long fought this, have long fought U.S. capitalism-imperialism and its wars, does not mean that we accept, as a revolutionary gesture, the opposition to American capitalism by another fascist or religious fanatic, any more than we accepted Nazism or Japanese military opposition to American imperialism.

Of course the seeded fact of Carter must be stopped, and his is also the hand that can remove a nuclear holocaust, which would put an end to civilization as we have known it. Revolutionary opposition against American imperialism can be carried through only if we raise a banner of what we are for. And what we are for is not turning the clock back to some form of occlusion.

Anyone who tries to glide a neo-conservative occlusion, forgetting that the “masses” that Hitler mobilized were mobilized for counter-revolutionary purposes; anyone who tries to say that Khomeini’s constant reference to the “disenfranchised masses” is akin to Mao’s “Cultural Revolution,” should be made to remember that — though Mao was once a revolutionary, and though Mao did labor under the illusion that making Russia “Enemy No. One” (like Khomeini’s making the U.S. “Satan”) was the way to fight for world socialism — Mao ended by selling out the Red Carpet for Nixon.6 As we said then, the “revolutionary” fascist apologists who were willing to forgive him every sin he had and leave a few blankets for these he might create later, were revealing that one and only one organic trait characterizes them all: endless is a state power. This is the exact opposite to what Khrushchev’s Marxism is — the struggle for a totally new, classless, social order, based on totally new human relations. Anything short of that spells out betrayal.

Yours,

Haya

Discussion Article:
Iran--philosophy and form of organization

DECEMBER, 1979

With the following excerpts from a contribution written by an Iranian revolutionary activist and thinker, we initiate a new series of discussion articles on the question of form of organization. None represent in any sense an "official viewpoint" of News and Letters Committee; all are intended to help find paths to overcome the separation of philosophy and organization which has again and again proved fatal to revolutions in our time.

by Raha

What is now above all bolstering my mind—and has for the past few months—is a form of organization which matches the content of its. The question of organization has long been a matter of controversy: and it is no accident that in Raya Dounysvayakuas "On the Threshold of the 1960s" the same question has been brought up again and again. She emphasized this matter and defines it as a "burning question of our day... the question of form of organization."

I am sure it is no accident that in Iran and in the USA true revolutionaries have once more put this question on the agenda; this above all arises from the same need in both countries, the need to relate "philosophy and organization."

It is important to note that Marx himself never neglected this question. In fact, he brought it up as early as 1844 when he was writing his Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts. Here he speaks of practice: "In order to supersede the idea of private property communist ideas are sufficient, but genuine communist activity is necessary in order to supersede real private property. It is no accident that right after the matter of private property he brings forth the question of organization."

Let's listen to Marx himself: "When communist associations, teaching and propaganda are their first aim, but their association itself creates a new need—the need for society—and what appeared to be a means has become an end."

MARX SPEAKS OF the necessity of an association, a type of association that does not contradict the "freely associated" society of the future, and it, in fact, itself a model of the future society—a freely associated organization. We can certainly derive a theoretical result from what he defines as an association which itself "becomes an end." This theoretical result is that we should seek a kind of organization which is, at one and the same time, in unity with the philosophy of revolution and with the aim of the proletariat as a class.

So, if we are to abolish hierarchy, our organization (society) should not be based on hierarchy; if we to abolish all the existing authorities, our organization should not be an authoritarian one; in short, a unity of content and form, subjective and objective, must be what we are in search of.

What we witnessed in the case of Iran was the total separation of spontaneity from organization. Creativity of the masses was such that they of the vanguard organizations could keep up with it... Of course, we do not count on Marxists, Stalinists and that sort to criticize themselves and try to learn a lesson from history and the existing objective conditions. No, we are instead emphasizing the new forces...

Of all the Left organizations in Iran, the Fadayan rate the strongest. They, as well as most of the Left, not only believe in a vanguard but have such a centralist and hierarchical form of organization that it absolutely matches the content. No wonder that their objective aim is to form a vanguard party; they view the absence of a vanguard party as one of the main factors that led to the establishment of the present government.

One other factor is that for a long time they were so busy with their belief in guerilla warfare (voluntarism) that in reality they totally forgot the masses...

IN SPEAKING ABOUT the need for an organization one cannot neglect the deficiencies of the material conditions and blame all the negative aspects of the present ongoing revolution on the lack of a proper organization. Even with a theory of revolution in hand, one should not expect a sudden change in the balance of political forces nowadays existing in Iran. For that to take place, theory must be materialized. We should search for ways through which theory can be materialized, ways which turn theory into a fundamental part of the revolution. In doing so, we should derive the practical essence of theory from its relation to the objective conditions...

It is no secret that in Iran capitalist was not developed in the womb of the old society, but rather was introduced from outside. Consequently, the historical processes that the European countries went through, the processes which gave rise to the bourgeois and the proletariat, did not take place in Iran. If the process of disintegration of the old European society was a matter of two or three centuries, it was only a matter of decades in Iran...

I must admit that the Iranian working class fully participated in the overthrow of the Shah and if it were not for the decisive role of the proletariat (especially the oil workers) even the overthrow of the Shah couldn't have happened. But we should not forget that it was not the proletariat who started the revolution. Indeed, they came a little too late on the political scene.
WHEN THE FIRST general strike of the oil workers took place, their first demand was the release of political prisoners and the second was the lifting of martial law... Are these demands directly socialist demands, or were they mere reflection of the general demands of society...

No one could distinguish workers from shopkeepers when it came to the matter of street demonstrations. And these are the general conditions that cleared the way for Khomeini and his "holy alliance".

Mars points out in "Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right" that "no class in civil society can play this part (satisfying universal domination) unless it can arouse in itself and in the masses a movement of enthusiasm in which it associates and identifies with society at large, identifies itself with it, and is felt and recognized as the general representative of society... It is only in the name of general interest that a particular class can claim general supremacy...

SO IT IS NOT sufficient to say that Khomeini has come to power as a counter-revolution; we should also explain the how and why. It is not enough to say that Khomeini is an alien; we must also describe the conditions under which he came to play such an important role. Khomeini's role is not as he himself claims, a gift from God, but has its base in the profane world.

In dealing with this matter we must ask, what is the objective-subjective condition of the working class? After answering these questions we can come to the theoretical conclusion that in the first chapter of the revolution in Iran, it was not the proletariat who was the leading force, and it was not possible for them to come to power and begin the total uprooting of capitalism. Even with a philosophy of revolution in the hands of the intellectuals we would have had a similar result. For "It is not enough that thought should make itself, reality must also strive towards thought." (Marx)

What I have arrived at, of course, does not mean an end. For what appears to be the end is rather new beginning. The symptoms of the new beginning become visible as we are approaching the end of the first chapter of the revolution. That is to say, in the womb of the movement that was needing the overthrow of the Shah there was to be seen the emergence of another one which seeks not a mere political emancipation but a complete, human emancipation. And this new beginning started precisely when the workers demanded full control over production when they formed their councils...

IT IS PRECISELY this objective-subjective achievement right before Khomeini's takeover that set the ground for the next chapter and declared the revolution to be "permanent". Then, right after Khomeini had taken over, we have the revolutionary women pouring into the streets and demanding liberation for women as well as men. In fact, women's liberationists gave a new meaning in what foreign countries...

Then we witnessed the struggle of revolution against counter-revolution growing daily. Non-stop workers' strikes, May Day demonstrations, demonstrations of unemployed workers, and youth have done a lot to disclose the nature of the new government. And then we have witnessed the class-based struggle of the Kurds for self-determination which was a serious blow to Khomeini's authority.

Out of the actual struggle of women seeking liberation, national minorities seeking self-determination, the proletarian aiming for an end to class domination, has come a totally new concept of revolution. A concept which, although new in Iran, was long before developed by Karl Marx.
Danayevskaya's response to an Iranian revolutionary

We excerpt below a letter from Raha Danayevskaya written in reply to Raha, an Iranian revolutionary writer and thinker, whose discussion article on "freedom, philosophy and form of organization" appeared in NEWS & LETTERS, December, 1979. -Ed.

November 3, 1979

Dear Raha,

You are the first who saw anything about me, the early writings. The opposite is true: the early writings are always quoted as if Marx was both "pre-Marxist" and, very rashly, as if on the question of "the Party", and then you quote what Marx said on "community affairs form associations". It seems that Marx's work is like a new "need", the need for society-and what appeared to be needed has become an end. It is clear that you have sensed something that does indeed reconnect with Marx on the question of freely-associated men and women, and that you have every right to conclude "that theoretical result is that we should seek a kind of organization which is, at one and the same time, in unity with philosophy of the revolution and with the aim of the proletariat as a class."

Where I disagree is that you make too quick a leap to the present with the result, much as you want to do the opposite, you are really once again separating philosophy and organization. For example, we, of course, are not only emphasizing "new force" but also "the body", and that is absolutely indispensable. So that you cannot possibly jump to the contradictions where every word you say is correct (both against a primitive form of organization and philosophy, and that against a vanguardism and voluntarism), and yet it would appear at the end as if it were only, because they were separated from the masses instead of it being both that and completely lacking in philosophy.

I think you ask the right question—"how a theory can be materialized"-but then make the materialization of a theory only that which relates to objective conditions, as if that, means economics, whereas in fact to Marxist-Humanism, objective conditions are both economics and the masses revolting against that economics. It's very dangerous because that's exactly what has been wrong for the whole second international and with Trotskyism, that somehow in the process of the economic analysis, the proletariat itself became the object. To Marx, however, material did not mean just economics. It meant the whole form of life, so that the need naturally was first and foremost food and shelter, but also all that was needed, by no means limited to whether you had a room to eat with or you were eating with your fingers, but the need for what Marx called "quest for universality."

I disagree that the proletariat were not the first in the Iranian revolution. Of course, the so-called first, whether it's Father Gaspas leading masses with horns to the Shah's palace, or whether it's poets in Iran revolting the heroes of the Shah's palace, or whether it's the journalist-editor in Nicaragua who was murdered by Sandinistas, precedes the actual proletarian upsurge. But it doesn't become revolution until the proletariat, both in strikes and its manifestations, that is to say, as masses in motion, appear. When Marx, as you quote, writes that both as a "movement of enthusiasm" and when the proletariat arouses the kind of interest that is an actual universal, that's possible for a particular class to claim general supremacy.

I believe that the really important thing is what you say: "What appears to be an end is rather a new beginning. It isn't true, however, that that new beginning can be only workers' councils, even when you correctly add them the "new forces" in the women's liberation, because one of the real deviations in Leninism was his concentration on totality, but not totally a new beginning, and that totally also meant more of a revolution to one of the absolute ideas which is both theory and practice, and that as a new beginning. I'm sure the Trotskyists would be very, very, very, workers' councils or a socialist revolution, and I'm sure that they would consider the councils a socialist institution-and by no means do I wish to play them down, because that definitely is the height of workers' councils or a socialist revolution, in their own right rather than being in a trade union or in a state.

But again, unless they do not separate themselves from philosophy, unless they too, feel as strongly the need for work on an intellectual, as the intellectuals feel the strong need for the workers; and unless they give the intellectualism and the intellectuals the role of the revolutionary Marxists, we can only play down. I should add that when Marx wrote "revolution is the class itself", that's exactly what he meant, the proletariat as a class. Reason as well as force, as objective as well as subjective, as now man/woman.

Yours,
Raha
Reason and revolution vs. conformism and technology

by Naya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION

(Among the many serious responses we received to Naya Dunayevskaya's "In Memoriam: Herbert Marcuse," published in the Aug/Sep. 1979 NAI, were several suggesting that we reproduce her original review of Marcuse's One-Dimensional Man, "Reason and Revolution vs. Conformism and Technology," which appeared in the Activist (Fall 1964), a journal published by students at Oberlin, Ohio. Excerpts from that review follow.—Ed.)

Professor Marcuse's new and highly original book, One-Dimensional Man, is notable as the title might suggest, just one more journalistic work on the alienation of modern man. Again, despite its subtitle, Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society, Professor Marcuse, far from limiting his study to that of ideology, tries to go to the root of the putrefying onedimensional philosophy, in the automatic productive process itself. Indeed, in his attempt to restore the great power of "negative thinking" and to center attention on the dialectical development of the objective world, as well as in the field of thought, Marcuse "subverts" conformism both in being and in thought...

A discussion, however, pervades the book's three major parts: "One-Dimensional Society," "One-Dimensional Thought," and "The Chance of the Alternatives." On the one hand, the author is weighted down by full awareness that the transformation of reality cannot be achieved in thought; it must be experimented in practice. "In other words, society would be rational and free to the extent to which it is organized, sustained, and reproduced on an essentially new historical basis." (p. 252) On the other hand, Professor Marcuse stresses over and over again, the totality of historical reality as the basis against the emergence of a new subject. (p. 224)

His socialism is not merely psychological; it is deeply rooted in his concept of technology's rationality; in his attitude that the proletariat has not lived up to its potential by his questioning, where not rejecting outright Marx's concept of the proletariat as the "class of the future" as the advanced industrial society. No wonder that Marcuse's studies were developed outside of the range of workers' voices opposing the onedimensional condition of automated labor.

There is one single exception to this prevailing condition of Professor Marcuse's book: a workers' pamphlet, Westers Battle Automatism by Charles Denby, which happened at the same time to be the editor of News & Letters, to which Marcuse likewise refers in the introduction...

*One-Dimensional Man by Herbert Marcuse (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964),
critique within the process of the development of philosophical thought itself from its origins in the dialectics of Plato to the science of Whorfian and the absurdities of Wittgenstein: "The totalitarian universe of technologi-
cal rationality is the latest transmutation of the idea of
reason ... the process by which logic becomes the logic of
domination." (p. 123)

As against this, dialectics would reveal the true an-
tagonytic structure of reality and of thought trying to
grasp this reality: "If man has learned to see and know
what really is, he will act in accordance with truth.
Epistemology is in itself ethical and ethics epistemology..."
To the extent to which the experience of an antagonistic
world guides the development of the philosophical
categories, philosophy moves in a universe which is
broken in itself. (dualism: sociolysics) — two-
dimensional. Appearance and reality, untruth and truth.
(said, as we shall see, untruth and freedom): are
ontological conditions ... Philosophy originates in di-
alogic; its universe of discourse responds to the facts
of an antagonistic reality." (p. 123)

Professor Marcuse promises a vast amount of
knowledge on the part of his readers. But it appears to
this reviewer that this part is especially important to
the college students daily exposed to "(it not brain-
washed) the pragmatist, vulgarly empirical, positivistic
not to mention the excess philosophic of the day. As
against Wittgenstein's language games, where ordinary
language is really sterilized and sanitised" (p. 165),
and as against "pure" science, science without fakery,
Marcuse does appeal to the transcendent view, but from
first to last, his critical theory is op-
posed to all metaphysics by virtue of the rigorously hys-
torical character of the transcendence." (p. 61) The
transcendent is not in heaven, but on earth; the historic
is intrasocial, human, actual as against only the potential
and inherent.

It is precisely, however, when Marcuse reaches the
stage of freedom where he once again questions Marx's
concept of the proletarian as the liberating force, and
where he once again overcomes his view of "the
Chances of the Alternative" which forms the last part of
his work...

TWO ELEMENTS — one from theory, and from
the objective world — save the critical philosophy that
Professor Marcuse overlooks. One is that the critical
theory refers to ideology and leaves the field to "an
empirical sociology, which, freed from all theoretical
guarantees, accepts a methodologies, one, succumbs to
the fallacies of 'misplaced concreteness'..." (p. 254)
If ever the philosopher should see only the hopeless,
Marcuse maintains, he would nevertheless, with "to
remain loyal to those who, without hope, have given
and still their lives to the Great Refusal." (p. 257)

The other element of hope is of much greater im-
port since it is both objective and subjective and has
the force to undermine the status quo: ... underwrites the
conservative popular basis in the substratum of the out-
casts, and outsiders, the exploited and persecuted of
other races and other colors, the unemployed and the
unemployable...their opposition is revolutionary even
if their consciousness is not. Their opposition hits the
system from without and is therefore not defeated by
the system; it is an elementary force which violates the
rules of the games and, in doing so, reveals it as a rigged
game." (pp. 202-07)

There are those who think that the time for the all-
dimensional man passed with the Renaissance. There are
others, like this reviewer, who think this is still the first
coming. And there are the conformists whose total in-
difference to discussion of anything plural-dimensional
is to bury One-Dimensional Men without even getting a serious dialogue around it started in the ac-
demic world. I trust the youth will not let this happen.
Thereby they will become part of history-in-the-making
in the realm of thought.
Editorial Article:
CARTER’S DRIVE TO WAR

by Raya Dunayevskaya

National Chairman, News and Letters Committees

President Carter’s bellicose State of the Union address manifested more than just the instant transformation of a “born-again Christian” into a mail-listed militant. So hot-house was his rush to plunge the country into Cold War II that the talk of military responses that the war atmosphere created was dominated not just by talk, but by actual landed in the Israeli, in the oil-rich Gulf region. The Marines, attached to infantry, artillery and armored units, started their round-the-world “exercise” Tuesday, Feb. 21, by flying from Hawaii to the U.S. naval base at Subic Bay in the Philippines. They will number 1,200 by the time they reach the Gulf area in mid-March.

In a word, the President’s talk of acquiring bases and facilities, creation of a rapid deployment force, and military that will stretch all the way from Russia’s southern border to Africa as well as the Middle East ports.

U.S. CHRISTENS AFGHANISTAN/Pakistan/Iran Triumphant Defense Line

All this war hysteria is based on nothing more substantial than Carter’s assumption that Russia’s invasion of Afghanistan—where is some 400 miles away from the Persian Gulf and would require launching Pakistan to get there—is equal to Russia’s already being in the Gulf region. It is not that anyone outside of Russia and its satellites are committing Russia’s invasion of Afghanistan: It is, rather, that Carter’s tactic with positive results discuss him on the proud, all-prepared to strike “the enemy,” using any excuse to promote his imperial designs.

This has become so obvious that even so conservative a former ambassador to Russia at George F. Kennan wrote: “After the Cold War II has there been anything resembling a militarization of thought and discourse in the U.S.? A new, and more sinister, phenomenon has been at the heart of it, could only conclude that the last hope of peaceful, nonmilitary solutions had been exhausted— that from now on only weapons, however used, could count.” (New York Times, Feb. 1, 1980.)

Put another way, the President’s propagandists speech created its own momentum so much that it took only a few weeks to draw a line in the sand, where the militant, without even consulting with the Congress, and to declare it the new “national defense line.” Though it is thousands of miles away from the U.S. and surrounded by indigenous governments, their natural resources were declared to be in the U.S. “vital interests.” And, of course, Carter named himself the Big Brother “protector.”

What followed was just as amazing: another instant transformation, this time of that reactionary and bloodthirsty fundamentalist, Pakistan’s General Zia, into an ally. This is the general who has been busy secretly building a nuclear device; and who, when exposed, refused to listen to Carter’s protestations against nuclear proliferation, and talked about the need for an “Islamic bomb” for defense. This is the general who sent a “letter” that the Pakistan Carter has made him the latest kingpin in the Middle East. Indeed, it was only nearly toppled by the Bangladesh people who have carried on a four-year civil war and still actively oppose Zia. This is the man who, just a few short weeks ago, charged his more than 100,000 troops to destroy the American Embassy at Islamabad, where three U.S. soldiers died. At that point, President Carter felt compelled to cut off both military and economic aid to Pakistan. Suddenly, however, it is this same General Zia, ruler of this same unstable country, who is declared to be the “strongman” for containing Russia, for which purpose Carter is once more piling up that reactionary militaristic regime by arming it to the teeth.

CARTER RENAMES AND EXTENDS NIXON-KISSINGER DOCTRINES

The new, imp. ally-designated Carter Doctrine” is a combination of the infamous Nixon-Kissinger Doctrine, which was just as imperially designated when Kissinger decided to lift toward Pakistan at the very moment of its bloody suppression of what was to become Bangladesh, just because Kissinger’s boss, Nixon, decided to play the U.S. card in the contest with the other nuclear super-power for world domination.

The Carter Administration is doing more than “playing” the China card: Defense Secretary Harold Brown has used his trip to China to announce that the U.S. will now sell China arms. Where even Kissinger-Nixon left at words, rather than immediately spelling out what their doctrine meant, concretely, our new superhawk, President Carter, announced at once that at home, too, politics has been turned into a question of life and death, by announcing the registration of youth for the draft, “when needed.”
MARCH, 1980

The answer of the youth throughout the country can be seen in anti-drug demonstrations under the slogan "No Smoke, No Lie, No War!" (see pp. 1 and 71. It becomes imperative to examine more closely the long list of consequences in the underdeveloped and semi-developed world. The vaccination of the underdeveloped world is a crucial task.

It is imperative to examine more closely the long list of consequences in the underdeveloped world. The vaccination of the underdeveloped world is a crucial task.

Afghanistan, a small country in the heart of the Islamic world, has been a target for many years. The Soviet Union, which invaded Afghanistan in 1979, has been trying to stabilize the situation. However, the situation remains unstable.

Afghanistan, a small country in the heart of the Islamic world, has been a target for many years. The Soviet Union, which invaded Afghanistan in 1979, has been trying to stabilize the situation. However, the situation remains unstable.

AFGHANISTAN'S REVOLUTION DEVOURS ITSELF

The coup which brought the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPF) to power had popular support. It established the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, confiscated all the royalist lands and holdings, nationalized the land reforms and the abolition of all feudal and pre-feudal relations. The party won power in a single day of fighting because there had been growing dissatisfaction among the poor, who saw themselves as having been abandoned by the new government.

However, the new government faced numerous challenges. It struggled to gain control of the country and to establish stability. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 added to the complexity of the situation. The movement faced opposition from various groups, including the Taliban and other militant groups. The situation remained tense and volatile.

AFGHANISTAN, 1983

China, with both ideological battles and actual guerrilla warfare, the Sino-Soviet Conflict had, indeed, found an echo also in Afghanistan. Instead of having its roots among the dominant nationality, the Pathans, as did the leaders of the PDPF—Taliqui, Hamid and Karzai—China tried to get a foothold among the minorities—Tajiks, Uzbekis, Hazaras, Turkmens, Balochis. Small as the Nauli tribe was, it quickly learned to use the word "revolution" against the

PDPF. China had no intention of confining their struggle to an ideological level, and began not only feeding guerrillas but cooperating with the most reactionary regime in Pakistan.

Whether or not, Dr. Benazir Bhutto knew of that aspect of the relationship between China and Pakistan long before the successful 1979 coup, there was no doubt whatever that his 1979 tilt to Pakistan was China-brokered. In June 1979, when the Chinese People's Liberation Army (PLA) occupied the Soviet border town of Potanin, the PLA used the occasion to come out publicly, saying that it was China's policy to support the government of Prime Minister Ziaul Haq of Pakistan.

At the same time—within a short year—the fratricidal factionalism within the PDPF (also referred to as the Ghulam, or Nazim, which was the name of its paper) saw the revolution devouring itself. Land reform lagged behind, women's liberation was hardly begun, diseases and poverty were still rampant. And, not too far in the background stood Russia, ready with aid and arms and wanting, above all, not to see a genuine social revolution anywhere.
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The very first words from Tatars, as he became President and Prime Minister, show how gingerly the party was moving on the religious question: "In the name of God, the Merciful and Compassionate..."

Both Tatars and one of the Deputy Ministers, Amin, were more independent than Karmal, the other Deputy Minister, who had totally identified with Russia, even at the period when Russia was classifying the war with the Afghan army. Thus, when the PDPA gained power, Tatars and Amin managed to send Karmal and other such leaders out as ambassadors to foreign countries.

A totally new stage was reached when Tatars, after attending the so-called Non-Aligned Conference in Havana and becoming Brezhnev's favorite, suggested bringing Karmal back to Afghanistan. That evidently signified his death warrant, since as Amin was concerned, it was he, after all, who, with the help of his close associates in the Foreign Ministry and Secret Service, where he had many roots, engineered the April 27 coup. He had grand illusions about his own power and his ability to remain independent, and made it clear, even to foreign correspondents, that he had no intention of becoming a mere puppet of Russia. But Moscow was taking no chances on having another Tatars to contend with. No sooner had Amin engineered the coup in which Tatars lost his life than the Russians invaded Afghanistan.

MILITARIZATION NOT ONLY OF THE ECONOMY, BUT OF THE MIND

Russia's invasion of Afghanistan lit up the sky for Carter-Destinetti, who had not been a party to their grand opportunity to warm their way into the good graces of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Carter kept sending messages to Khomeini that Russia, not the U.S., was the main enemy of Islam. Carter's U.S. interventionism was helpful to the Saudis, the Gulf, and the Gulf region.

Two years ago—that is, before the invasion of Afghanistan—Carter's Administration embarked on a "study" of a most unhappy series of "options" of what to do to the Soviet Union, to the United States, to the world. It is only now, on Feb. 1, 1980, that the 70-page report has been published, played up by the New York Times as pages one under the heading title: "Study Says Soviet Threat in Iran Might Require U.S. Atom Arms."

We have here a display of not only how to make the unthinkable thinkable, but how to spell it out as "necessary." (1) publish a "study," though it concerns Iran, when the headlines are showing Carter's Cold War hysteria over Afghanistan; (2) accompany the article with a map listing most precisely what could become "three key oil-shipping points in the Persian Gulf—Iraq's Kharg Island, and Saudi Arabia's Ras Tanura and Jubayl," which "would be "prime targets" for Soviet attack in the event of war in the region"; (3) turn the discussion of the use of "nuclear" missiles into the use of "nuclear" nuclear weapons.

The entire set of all this talk about nuclear weapons is the Pentagon report's galling assertion that the Iranians will not even be able to contribute effectively to their own defense—let alone the U.S. Carter's "nuclear" nuclear weapons policy is ready to be Islam's "protector.

As for Russia's invasion, long, long ago, in the last days of Lenin's life, he carried on his battle against Stalin's Russian chauvinism in the matter of the Georgians. He came to the defense of the Georgian Communist, Tsereteli, who said: "It is true that Stalin wanted the union of the proletariat of the whole world, but I never claimed that all the Russians ought to sail with Tribuk." With a single word changed—Egaben, instead of Tribuk—we have the exact situation today, of any day when a workers' state gets transformed into its opposite, as did Russia into a state-capitalist society.

Carter's policy does more than Stalin in putting down national liberation struggles, he is presently in Afghanistan, Iran, Pakistan, or India. He has spilled this oil in a way that does not let anyone get away from his clutches, not only in foreign lands but at home, especially the youth, who, in the main, are in the Army, and the blacks, who will continue to bear the main brunt of the repressions and costs of the ever-expanding militarization of the economy. As Vernon Jordan of the Urban League pointed out: "We are the boat people without boats."
Erich Fromm, Socialist Humanist

The March 10, 1960, press wire carried the sad news of Erich Fromm's death. After this was but 2 days short of his 60th birthday, and he had been ill for several years. Fromm was both intellectually and emotionally so alert and active that he was at work on a new book. In putting him only as a "mechanical psychosomatologist," the press, by no accident at all, failed to mention that he was a Socialist Humanist. Moreover, in writing Marx's Concept of Man (which preceded it) and in introducing Marx's Humanist Essays to a wide American public, editing the two International symposium on Socialist Humanism, he did, not, as an academician, but as an activist, in inviting me to participate in that dialogue between East and West as well as North and South, he stressed that "it took quite a lot of courage on their (East European) part to write something for this volume, for no matter how diplomatic the language, they were open attacks on the Soviet Union." Erich Fromm was an original. In attempting to fuse Marx and Freud, it wasn't so much the uniqueness of such a move in the 1920s that needed to be stressed, but the fact that even when he was a most orthodox Freudian, it was social psychology that interested him. His use of psychoanalytic mechanisms were as a sort of mediating concept between the individual and the social. In any case, as he moved away from orthodox Freudianism to elaborate his own version, it was clear that he was breaking not only with Freud but with the famous Frankfurt School and its "Critical Theory" and that, not because he was moving away from Marxism, but coming closer to it. Here is how he puts it in his intellectual autobiography:

"I consider Marx, the thinker as being of much greater depth and scope than Freud...But even when all of this is said, it would be naive to ignore Freud's influence on him. Although this was the name of a new psychology...it was Freud's influence that created the unconscious processes and the dynamic nature of character..."...character..."to the science of man which has altered the picture of man for all time to come." (In the Choice of Illness: My Contest with Marx and Freud by Erich Fromm.)

On Fromm's initiative, on my great surprise, and of my whole life, please note that many psychologists even when they laid claim to Marxism, I received a concrete historical picture of Marx and his ideas from that which was characteristic of a generation which has shaped the whole of the book as it is a human being, as he refused to be frightened either by the fact that I let my hostility to psychoanalytic show, and by my lack of interest in the social revolution. In the book, Fromm'sfather referred to them as "hard sherlocks," or even by the fact that I criticized his own book on "Marx's Concept of Man" as abstract. Here is what we can extract:

"As to your criticism of my essay that it is too abstract and does not discuss the hierarchy of Man's society, concretely, I cannot offer any argument... As to the substance of the points you make about the concrete nature of Marx's humanism, I am not sure whether I am about what you write of the role of the class psychosomatologist and David Riesman.

Our correspondence continued for two decades. It also gave me one glimpse into the whole subject of the famous Frankfurt School, of which the was, after all, one of its most famous personalities, the one who influenced him all on the "integration" of Psychoanalysis into Marxism and the debate with Herbert Marcuse in the pages of the New Left. Here is how he summed it up in a letter to me dated November 22, 1972:

"I get quite a few questions from various people who study the history of the Frankfurt School. It's really a funny story: Horkheimer is now quoted as the creator of the critical theory and people write about the critical theory as if it were a new concept discovered by Horkheimer. As far as I know, the whole thing is a hoax, because Horkheimer was frightened of speaking about Marx's theory. He used general epistemological and of critical theory in order not to say Marx's theory. I believe that is all behind this discovery of critical theory by Horkheimer and Adorno."

Fromm's eyes were always on the future and a new classless society on truly human foundations. Least known of his multi-dimensional concept was the relationship of Man/Woman and by no means on just a psychological scale. Rather it was the need for totally new human relations in the Marxist sense: a global vision of the future meant a look back into the past. Thus, he found Barth's study into social relations very original, not because he believed in the existence of classless society, but because it, at least, allowed one a vision of an alternative society to this patriarchal, class, alienated, and dehumanized world. In relating patriarchry to class domination, he had created the magnificent phrase for it: "patriarchal-acquisitive."

Fromm's reminiscences of things past being a question merely of memory, it belongs into view the unity of Man/Woman; the human being as a totally, being freed not just a question of material, but dialectically, showing movement, a movement forward. It was what Fromm observed when, in creating an international forum for his Socialist Humanism, he emphasized that Horkheimer was not just an idea, but a movement against it, a glimpse into the future. Listen to what he wrote when he heard it was relating Rosa Luxemburg, "he was a human being, and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution:"

I feel that the male Socialism never could understand Rosa Luxemburg, nor could she acquire the influence. I feel that the perversion of Stalin and Chinese Communism, so magnificently of an objective human being was, he refused to be frightened either by the fact that I let my hostility to psychoanalytic show, and by my lack of interest in the social revolution. In the book, Fromm's father referred to them as "hard sherlocks," or even by the fact that I criticized his own book on "Marx's Concept of Man" as abstract. Here is what we can extract:

"As to your criticism of my essay that it is too abstract and does not discuss the hierarchy of Man's society, concretely, I cannot offer any argument... As to the substance of the points you make about the concrete nature of Marx's humanism, I am not sure whether I am about what you write of the role of the class psychosomatologist and David Riesman.

Our correspondence continued for two decades. It also gave me one glimpse into the whole subject of the famous Frankfurt School, of which the was, after all, one of its most famous personalities, the one who influenced him all on the "integration" of Psychoanalysis into Marxism and the debate with Herbert Marcuse in the pages of the New Left. Here is how he summed it up in a letter to me dated November 22, 1972:

"I get quite a few questions from various people who study the history of the Frankfurt School. It's really a funny story: Horkheimer is now quoted as the creator of the critical theory and people write about the critical theory as if it were a new concept discovered by Horkheimer. As far as I know, the whole thing is a hoax, because Horkheimer was frightened of speaking about Marx's theory. He used general epistemological and of critical theory in order not to say Marx's theory. I believe that is all behind this discovery of critical theory by Horkheimer and Adorno."

Fromm's eyes were always on the future and a new classless society on truly human foundations. Least known of his multi-dimensional concept was the relationship of Man/Woman and by no means on just a psychological scale. Rather it was the need for totally new human relations in the Marxist sense: a global vision of the future meant a look back into the past. Thus, he found Barth's study into social relations very original, not because he believed in the existence of classless society, but because it, at least, allowed one a vision of an alternative society to this patriarchal, class, alienated, and dehumanized world. In relating patriarchry to class domination, he had created the magnificent phrase for it: "patriarchal-acquisitive."

Fromm's reminiscences of things past being a question merely of memory, it belongs into view the unity of Man/Woman; the human being as a totally, being freed not just a question of material, but
Carter’s intrusion, Khomeini’s ‘Holy War’

by Raya Dunyavitskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION
and Moshe and Freedom

The following are excerpts from the recent Politik
Philosophical Letter by Raya Dunyavitskaya, “The Cer
ters/Borderless-Conquest Imperialist Intrusion into Iran—
and What About Khomeini/Bani-Su‘ad’s ‘Holy War’
against the Left?”. The full letter is available from News & Letters; see ed., p.8-11.

BY NO ACCIDENT whatever a real war mad
Colonel, the Open Top American Bager, with a Hunt
Green Batet Colonel Beckett, trained in the decade-long U.S.
imperialist war in Vietnam — was chosen to command
the “Blue Light” elite corps to descend upon Iran in
the dark of the night of April 24 . . . Here was a gory
mission that had gone through 20 reconnaiss, stretched
over a period of nearly six months, involving six C-133
Hercules transport planes, which had proven their
technological superiority in the decade-long bloody Viet
Nam War, with eight equally proficient Biansky AH-56
helicopters, all manned by a volunteer, gang ho military
outfit, armed not only with weapons but cannisters filled
with sleeping gas, which, after only three hours in the
desert, with no enemy in sight, suddenly falls apart.
First, three helicopters malfunction; then, comes the
commanders-in-chief to abandon the mission. It is now 2:15 a.m. of April 25. The flare
departure becomes a tragedy along the transport plane and
helicopter collision and eight American bodies go up in
flames. The Green Batet Colonel orders the rest of the
crew into a plane without either picking up the bodies,
or destroying the secret documents. Five dozen seriously
burned are taken aboard. It is now 4 a.m.

It is impossible to conceive each a total failure un
less the reason behind the order to abort the operation
had nothing whatsoever to do with either the advanced
military technology of the lives of the American hostages
that were supposed to have been rescued. Two prob
ably taken as prisoners — not as the military
accounting. One is that the CIA is still cooperating
with BAVAR and this actual Fifth Column in Iran and could
be swiftly reduced by the CIA-sponsored Fifth Column .

Whether or not President Carter is so nimble
on the reporting of his powers in this election year
that even the prospect of unleashing World War III
can sway his hand, this is a fact that the Iranian mid
adventure can in no way be separated from Carter’s
internal drive for war that he had begun long before.
The point is that Carter’s proposal for reestablishing draft
registration for the youth has, indeed, a global imperialist
outlook.

It becomes imperative, therefore, that our struggle
against Carter’s drive for war is at the same time a
way to express our solidarity with the Iranian masses in
their anti-imperialist struggle. In doing so we must
make sure that the struggle for freedom does not get
isolated from a philosophy of liberation. And therein,
precisely, lies the deep contradiction in the Iranian
revolutions and the present peace of the Khomeini/Bani-Su‘ad unleashed of the unholy “Holy War” against the Left,

II

NOTHING WAS MORE ghastly than the hanging
Judge Ayubshah. Saeed Khakhali’s display of the
burned corpses of the eight American soldiers had
intended to put them on trial . . . . What is as dishonoring
as a matter as that calculated display is the statement of
the supposed moderate Bakfi-Su‘ad, Dr. Jumah
Khomeini, which maligned the Iranian Left as having
a mind with Carter’s imperialism venture. What
connection with Carter’s Khomeini/Bakfi-Su‘ad/Sheikh-Su‘ad/Bani-Su‘ad have
unleashed is a move against the very forces that were
in the forefront of the Islamic Revolution of the
Shah.

Not only is there no connection between the deep
urgency and Carter’s intrusion into Iran (and Bakfi-Su‘ad knows it), but the ruling clique in Iran has
shown an affinity to the rulers in any capitalist country
when they took advantage of the desert fires to hit out
against the Left, against the disintegration of the
great mass unemployment, against the national liber
ation movements, and especially, who have attempted
to deepen the Iranian revolution from more overthrow
of the Shah to actual freedom and new human relations.
Khomeini and Bakfi-Su‘ad knew that the opposition to
them began with their retreat from the doors of the
revolution, whether that related to Khameini’s trying
to turn the clock back on Women’s Liberation, or trying
to abolish the shrouds of the workers . . . .

The great unrest in the country is in inseparable
departure from a great passion for philosophy of liberation that
there isn’t a single expression — and there are no less
than 200 different groups attempting to articulate that
passion for freedom, in every form from pamphlets,
books, papers, leaflets, to caucuses — that does not at
once get grabbed up by the university campuses. It is
those books that so frighten Khameini and the so-
called Revolutionary Council that they order their goons
to attack the student youth. More than the riots these
sounds ignited — and there were many injured and
some dead — is the situation in the stalemated
politic of political activity. Khomeini is under the
illusion that, since the Left does not command
debates and meetings divided in the struggle
against the Shah, the idea of freedom will die . . . . What
the meaning will prove is that there is no illusion
whatever to let the revolution remain unfinished.

THE STRANGEST TOLERATION of all, if not
outright “love,” is the one that exists between
Khomeini and Tudeh. Anyone in the West is so accustomed to the 180 degrees turn, hypocrisies and outright alli
ances of absolute opposition on the part of the Russian
Communists over since the Hitler-Stalin Pact, which
gave the green light to World War II, that none in the
West were surprised by the declaration of the Secretary
General of the Iranian Communist Party, Nurreddin
Kanuri, that they are “followers of Imam Khomeini’s
ideology.”

When interviewed by an editor of Le Monde, Eric
Boureau, on the question of supporting terrorism,
Kanuri replied: “We are for denouncing terrorism, but
no principle can be eternal. We were supporting the
beginning we supported the arrest of the so-called diplomats be
cause they were engaged not only in espionage, but
in counter-revolutionary and subversive activity.” As
for continuing increased the American hostages, which flew in the face of international law, and which

*The Guardian, April 27, 1980 (Le Monde English
Section)
Russia also had to condemn, Khamenei let the cat out of the bag by approving the status quo of continuing the retention of the hostages when he said that it "was a good way of preventing the normalization of Iran's relations with the U.S."

It isn't true, however, that either the clerics who were with Khomeini in the '70s or Khomeini's secular followers are that tolerant of the Padeh Party. Khomeini's miserable role in that period has not been forgotten and the invasion of Afghanistan has made some worry over the new "populist" phase of the Communists who did receive 100,000 votes in Tehran alone in the first round of the elections.

Khomeini's "anti-imperialism" (which is only anti-America) and isolation of the Padeh Party while being totally opposed to genuine Marxists, is seen in the commander of the Revolutionary Guards which have the full support of Khomeini. Their commander, Abu Sharif, spelled out the danger from the U.S.: "The danger comes from U.S. leftist organizations." He expanded it thus: "There are U.S. leftist organizations which are arming themselves such as the Fedayi Khatam. There are other leftist organizations like the Padeh Party, which now it recognizes the Islamic Revolution's constitution and Imam Khomeini's line. In this case, it is a legal leftist organization that acts and works on this basis. But the danger comes from the U.S. leftist organizations, which receive funds and weapons from the West and falsely speak about a Russian threat to Iran to justify military relations with the United States." (MEHRIP REPORT, March/April 1980)

AS AGAINST KIANURID goal — "the breaking off of all remaining ties with the U.S."— and against Sharif saying that "the danger comes from U.S. leftist organizations," what becomes imperative is the forging of relations, revolutionary relations, between the masses in the U.S. and in Iran.

To prevent the real danger of a world holocaust, it is necessary to see that the enemy is not so much abroad as at home. It is here where philosophy of revolution becomes as crucial as social revolution itself. Ideas of freedom recognize no national boundaries. It is a fact that our rulers are our enemies and that the Iranian masses are our friends. The world revolution may not be on the agenda at this very moment, but it's that vision of a new world that is the ground for the actual struggle that will prevent nuclear holocaust by creating a new world on totally human foundations.

April 20, 1980
Ailoume Diop

We mourn the death, on May 2, of Ailoume Diop, whose creative presentation introduced a whole generation of French intellectuals, from Franso to Sartre, to African life, culture, politics, philosophy. With the founding of Pan-African, in 1960, he universalized this African presence for the whole world, though it took the Black Intellectuals in America more than a decade before they issued an English-language edition of his journal.

While it is true that nothing by an African was looked at with indifference by Diop, it isn't true that the journal was limited to contributions by Africans. Quite the contrary. Its dynamism of ideas reached out to the whole world without ever stopping to look at whether any contribution was considered authoritative by the ruling ideologies. I'm proud to say that my essay on Marxist Humanism was published in 1982.

And it certainly isn't true that only "culture" predominated in Diop's life. All one needs to do is to his pluralism, as in the 1960s as it had been in the 1800s, diverted Diop from his critique of the "integration of revolution and literature."

One of his favorite poets, the great Mallarmé, wrote: "Those who invent neither gunpowder nor the compass,

Those who never learned to control steam or electricity,

Those who never explored the sea or skies,

But they knew the fruitful corners of the end of the earth."

But Diop's point was that it wasn't only "suffering" but "revival" that required Black consciousness. The very universalization of culture required de-Westernization and need to be "contived in the cultural genius of the emergent world."

What will shape the blows we all feel at Ailoume Diop's death is the rich heritage he left us by creating a wayward road between the Third World and the Western world.

RAY DOUGLAS
June 2, 1982
China's 'Gang of Four' trial charade and the so-called Cultural Revolution; media and the global crises

by Raya Dunayer
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION and Socialism and Freedom

A good way of making sure that one understands absolutely nothing about what is going on in China, is to read everything that is printed in the newspapers and shown on TV. What has happened? Could it be that the reason why the U.S. media is brain-washing itself, repeating what is chanted out in Peking, is that the truth behind the Chinese amnesia of the "Gang of Four" with Lin Biao (Lin Piao) would reveal the connection between the Mao-Lin struggle and Henry Kissenger's presence in 1971 to Peking, watching Mao's trip to China? It is a fact that — at the same time that China's policy was completely reversed to transform the nuclear superpower, U.S. imperialism, into Friend Number One — the reactionary China Lobby, Richard Nixon, assisted Mao's China as the "new global power..."

In a word, nothing short of a shift in global power lies behind the story of the bizarre relationship of the U.S. media and the trials staged in Peking by Deng Xiaoping (Teng Hsiao-p'ing). WHY THE AMALGAM OF JIANG AND LIN?

Let's take a look at the simple incommensurability of the dates in the Mao-Huah war suddenly turned into a single amalgam. First came the 1971 Mao-Huah dispute, which ended in the death, or murder, of Lin, Jiang Qing (Chiang Ching) was in the forefront of the campaign of calumny against Lin that followed. What followed in immediate post-Mao China was what Jiang was arrested by the top cop, Hua Guofeng (Hua Kuo-feng) who helped give the present 1981 ruling clique the appearance of "legitimacy," since he supposedly had Mao's blessing to become Chairman. Where is he now? It was nearly four years between the arrest and the trials of the so-called Gang of Four, and the one who did the arresting is now nowhere around. 

"Does anyone doubt that it is really Mao Zedong (Mao Tse-tung) who is in control? Ah, there's the rub. Those in power now, like those who stand accused now — including Mao himself, are the same who, at one and the same time, both initiated and destroyed the Cultural Revolution."

What remains absent from all reports is any view of the objective world situation, that be in 1966 or in 1971; in 1972 when Mao was still alive or in the immediate post-Mao China, 1976, when Jiang was arrested. If, however, we hold fast to the objective world situation, it will not be too difficult to unravel all the plots and counter-plots which developed during the so-called Cultural Revolution. They came to a climax, not in any sort of "un-interpreted revolution," but in Mao's counter-revolution, any rolling out of the red carpet for Nixon after Nixon finished the mad bombing of Cambodia. That was followed by Nixon's visit to Pakistan — which was bloody attempting to stuff the new-born nation of Bangladesh — in order to get Mao's approval for Kissinger's trip to meet Zhou Enlai (Chou En-lai) and plan for that super spectacle, Nixon's trip to China.

JIAN QING ON THE STAND AND IN ACTION

By the end of the current trial, considerable sympathy was extended to Jiang Qing because she alone, of both the so-called Gang of Four and the military adherents of Lin Biao, displayed some strength of character not only in opposing the accusations against her, but in calling the judges "counter-revolutionaries," whom she challenged to behold her: "Revolutions is no crime. To rebel is justified," she shouted. Glaring at the presiding Judge, Zeng Hui-shou, she continued: "During the war it was I, the only woman ever, who followed and accompanied Chairman Mao to the front. At that time, where were all of you hiding?"

To say, as the prosecutor put it, that she was invoking the name of the Great Helmman only to save her skin — an accusation that Business Week (Nov. 24, 1980) repeated — is both to miss the point that it was Mao who did the commanding and Jiang who obeyed unquestioningly, and to try to describe Jiang of the dignity that a belief in your principles gives you — no matter how wrong these principles may be. It is this which to her two-hour defense also enabled her to be sarcastic of the West...

Actually, the latest in the series of arrests, following the army's suppression of the Cultural Revolution was that of the genuine Leftist, Chen Bo-da (Chen Po-ta) who was the head of the whole Cultural Revolution Group. Chen Bo-da had been Mao's political secretary ever since the mid-1940's in Peking. Indeed, there is no doubt whatever that many of Mao's speeches were written by Chen — otherupon he was the very first one Mao arrested and started sending their
entire charade that was going on, which featured her, as she put it, as if she were "some kind of devil with three heads." Tell the Monkey King to come and reach me how to grow several more heads, is that it? 2

Unfortunately neither the courage nor the sacrefice, nor the fact that she certainly didn't plot any assassina-
tion of Mao, can in any way clear her of the responsi-
ibility for the horrors of that so-called Cultural Revolu-
tion. The 20,000-word indictment charged that no less than 277,450 Chinese were mercilessly persecuted, and
that 34,273 died. But the only guilty proof of Jiang's
"direct crimes" was the unchannel display of a picture of
the bruised corpse of the former Coal Minister, Zhang
Liminh, whom, it was charged, she had ordered to be
beaten to death.

What preceded all of this and intensified the dif-
fERENCE between Liu and Mao was the question of rela-
tions with U.S. imperialism. It wasn't that Liu disagreed
2. The Manchester Guardian, Jan. 4, 1981 explains that the reference is to a mythical figure who
would grow on many heads as he chose, who would need to
help her if the devil had his way.

about relations with Russia; he was in the forefront of
calling Russian Enemy Number One. But his position was
that not only does Russia's "regression" have to be chal-
lenged, but so does U.S. imperialism. To the extent that
both the U.S. and Russia were held out as the enemies
of the masses, Liu was no different or Mao against Russia.
There was no difference between him and Mao either in
the initiation of the Cultural Revolution or in suppress-
ing it when it began to have a momentum of its own.

Again Jiang matched to their tune, adding a few
vicious persecutions of her own in the arts. Whether she
did or did not, by then, spread some "wild ambitions" of
her own is not what brought on the crisis in China.

(To Be Concluded Next Issue)

---

2. The expression is supposed to be Mao's in a letter to
His Goodness, whom he allegedly designated as his suc-
cessor. This period of vilification is briefly reported in
Communist China Ousting by Rosalind Wiltsen, it is a quite
superficial work. The same if in the only biography extant,
you should read it. So often my critique of it is written.
Politics and Revolution, a News & Letters publication.
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China’s ‘Gang of four’ trial charade and the so-called Cultural Revolution; media and the global crises

by Ray Denning

Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION and Maoism and Freedom

March, 1981

WHAT WAS THE BEGINNING? WHAT WAS THE ‘CULTURAL REVOLUTION’?

Let’s get back to fundamentals when Mao succeeded in overthrowing the corrupt Chiang Kai-shek, the puppet of U.S. imperialism.

The new China, Mao’s China, stood up to the whole imperialist world and won national independence. It did so at the head of a peasant army which asked the workers to continue working. It did maintain its national independence and put the country on its feet. It openly admitted that it was state-capitalism but claimed that the masses need not worry about it, since political power was in the hands of the Communist Party which would protect them. It also won another war — the Korean War. It gained help from Russia and embarked on its own Five Year Plan, restoring both the national economy, which lay in ruins, and peace.

In suppressing the voices of revolt at home, 1966-1967 began to look not only for a different foreign alignment, but a new world axis — a Third World axis to challenge the U.S. and Russia. On that there were no serious differences within the Poliburo, especially since the Sino-Soviet split had been transformed into the Sino-Soviet conflict and Mao had gained the adherents not only of the Chinese, but of the whole ruler of that (and, Sukarno).

Within and without, 1968 did, however, become the breaking point. First, Mao could no longer claim that China was the “besieged fortress” when U.S. imperialism was raining bombs on Hanoi, not on Peking. Secondly, in place of a Peking-Djakarta axis emerging, what broke out in Indonesia was the most horrifying counter-revolution. The veritable bloodbath — of revolutionary nationalists as well as Communists — put an end to that kind of Third World axis. By that time, not only did some of the Communist Parties which had sided with China in the Sino-Soviet conflict — such as the Korean CP — begin calling for a united front of all Communists, including Russia, for the defense of Vietnam against U.S. imperialism — but so did the majority of Mao’s own Poliburo.

The one who remained with Mao that year was Lin Biao; he came out with his speech, “Long Live the Victory of the People’s War,” which pronounced that, just as the Chinese Revolution had been victorious by having the peasant army “outflank” the cities, so the Third World could win by outflanking the industrialized world. As was characteristic of Mao when he became a minority, he disappeared.

When he re-emerged, it was with his greatest brain-storm — the so-called Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution — which, along with proclaiming the slogan, “Bombard the Headquarters!”, issued the slogans, “Russia Is Enemy Number One” and “Learn from the Army!”

Though the so-called Cultural Revolution was no proletarian revolution, the youth who took Mao at his word that “It is right to rebel” took that to mean a right to rebel against the Communist bureaucracy just as against capitalists. Indeed, they called their Communist leaders “capitalist ratters” and the revolt from below soon escaped the confines set by Mao. It was at that point that the order was given to put down the revolt and Lin led that counter-revolution. There was no doubt by that time that the main axis of power had moved into the Army, Lin’s army.

In the three Sheng-waider documents reproduced in Peking and the New Left: At Home and Abroad (published by the Center for Chinese Studies of the University of California, Berkeley, 1969), Chairman Mao, The Revolution is Dead, Long Live the Revolution, and edited by “The U.S., May 1970,” see also the Nov. 1969 issue of NL which contains an essay on the trial. Bob McGregor which includes the newest information from the opposition group within China, the Li Yihao.
THEORY / PRACTICE
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From the start of the Cultural Revolution, I had asked whether the delimitation of Mao was really misunderstood. The prevailing reader cannot help but wonder whether Mao is being defiled - or mummified. Is Liu being in the vanguard glory of Mao, as the press held, or is Mao being allowed to live out his remaining years as a deity only because he transferred total authority to Liu, the head of the Army? (See News & Letters, October, 1965)

THE 3rd "IN DISPUTE"

In 1969, the very year when the Ninth Congress declared Lin the "Chairman-comrade-in-arms" of Mao, the border dispute between Russia and China began on the Usuri River. The internal differences as to how much power the army took, and how much the state, were related both to these confrontations in particular, and to foreign events in general. It was almost directly after that very Congress that had specified Lin as Mao's successor that the dispute between Mao and Lin began.

It had been clear to Mao - who was no novice either in faction fights or in war, in maneuvers or in alliances with super-power imperialisms - that there truly was a difference between them, and that Lin stood in the way of his 10-degree turn to relations with U.S. imperialism. It wasn't Lin who began a so-called assassination plot. It was Mao - who began removing Lin from the power he had just granted him.

From the Borzoi to Stakli to Mao, there is certainly nothing new in the fact that rulers, as they prepare to remove one of their "colleagues," promptly accuse the one to be removed of the very crimes they are themselves committing. Thus Stakli, at the very time he was sending up test balloons to prepare for his pact with Hitler, accused General Tolstoychev of just that, and had him executed in the infamous Framers-Treiki. Nothing all this secrecy in camera. That, it was when Mao began getting Lin out of dealing with "foreign powers" that Mao, Zhou, and Deng were themselves taking the warm waters of U.S. imperialism - which at that particular moment was equally anxious, not just to establish friendly relations with China "for themselves," but to get off the hot seat of the Vietnam War and the so-called Nixon war against Cambodia, Yes, 1970-71 - as that red carpet began being prepared for Nixon’s arrival in China in 1972 — was quite a period of world tension.

By that time, Lin did, indeed, have an active faction and while it is doubtful whether any of the "capitulations" that Zhou, Mao, and Jiang were propagating about him were true — and no one really knows whether Lin was in the airplane which crashed in Mongolia — there is proof of the "Outline of Project 511" by which a plan to fight Mao, Lin's code-name for Mao was B52.

One of the proofs that outside Communists - including those who had been as close as the Khrushchevs - didn't believe the story of Lin being a "capitalist readers" and did surmise correctly that it was a question of the attitude to U.S. imperialism, was Edgar Snow's statement: "Old Lin approve the negotiations with Khrushchev and the decisions that were taken". The reference was to the Nov. 20, 1971 Chinese press release about those "engaged in conspiracy or plots," by which Mao very obviously meant Lin Biao.

In a word, because Lin's downfall came within a few days of Nixon's trip to Peking, it was not hard to reach the conclusion, so scrupulously kept secret by Mao, that Lin would, indeed, have been too serious an obstacle to "normalization" of relations with the U.S. The year, 1972 - between the fall of Lin and the time when the Chinese people first learned the story as officially conceded by Mao and Zhou, who read it to the 1972 Congress — was years in which it was clear that so much power had gone into the Army during the Cultural Revolution that even the death of Lin and the calmness against him had not succeeded in eliminating the Army opposition to Mao.

What remained of the Party leadership and of that government which had not been destroyed by the so-called Red Guards was in the hands of Zhou Enlai and poor Jiang Qing was left as mistress of the reformed army. With Mao's approval, they had to begin "rehabilitating" many of the old party leaders. Readied by Deng and focused on the economy as elaborated by Zhou and Deng, China was to continue on its state-capitalist road without Mao's presence of "permanent, uninterupted, continuous revolution."

WHERE TO NOW?

Where are the so-called Western scholar specialists on China who were talking nonsense - from Schram's Permanent Revolution to Karam’s From Revolution to Revolution - as we entitled our analysis, "From Counter-revolution to Counter-revolution" (See my Philosophy and Revolution). That is to say, we had high hopes those days when Mao, in proclaiming his philosophy in On Contadistion, had denuded the concept both of the Hegelian objective and Marx's class conflict - that what characterized Mao thought was endless class collaborationism, whether that was with Chiang Kai-shek in the war against Japan, or against Chiang Kai-shek and the so-called "fellow class" of national state-capitalism; whether that was Simo-Soviet "unbreakable" friendship or Sino-Soviet conflict, with China as the "first" "internationalism."

It is true that in taking a somewhat independent road from Russian state-capitalism and doing so from outside, the Chinese were able to escape the Stalinism and to travel the Russian road to full bureaucratization, he had attempted some aspect of the Marxist concept of continuous revolution in the sense that revolution does not allow with the conquest of power. But more one reduces both the philosophy of revolution and revolution itself to the concept of great Helmsman — to Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung, fragmented into bite-sized portions without any respect for historic conditions and mass movements from practice that would be inseparable
from movements from theory in a world that is totally capitalist and imperialist — there is absolutely no way to escape the capitalist, imperialist framework.

In any case, all that was left for Mao to do after he put down the self-created turmoil called the Cultural Revolution — and after he not only “rehabilitated” Deng, but what is a great deal worse, started to play with USA imperialism — there was no sort of revolutionary legacy he could possibly have the Chinese masses. Thus it was that in 1976, while staying away from the National People’s Congress run by Zhou and Deng with his “four modernizations,” Mao met with Franz Josef Strauss!

It is wrong, however, to think that, because the scholars were divided by Mao, the journalists have done any better in presenting the opposite side of the coin. Instead of overestimating Mao, they underestimated the entire Chinese revolutionary experience, though that was national.

In the New York Times of Jan. 2, 1951, Flora Lewis came up with the most superficial of all scenarios: “Winston Churchill got it backwards when he described the Soviet Union as a ‘riddle wrapped in a mystery inside of an enigma.’ It’s the other way around; inside is the inexplicable to be expected, and the mystery wrapper is to conceal the fact that there really isn’t much higher meaning — I think we’ll manage understanding better if we remove the veil from our own dazed eyes....” The only trouble is that it isn’t the eyes that are dazed, but the thought. The crisis in China would hardly be as intense as it is now if it had no, “higher meaning” than the “inexplicable to be expected.”

When the first spontaneous mass demonstration in Mao’s China sprang up on April 5, 1976 — in honor of Zhou Enlai who had died and was still being slandered by Mao, Jiang, et al. — Mao embarked on his last hurray. Whether inspired by Jiang or otherwise, he ordered the demonstration put down and Deng, who was blamed for instigating it, removed. Within a few months, Mao himself died and Jiang was left to hold the bag. In no time at all, she was arrested.

Whether or not Jiang escapes death now in order, as Deng put it, not to make a martyr of her and whatever punishment is slated out to Lin’s adherents, the point at issue is not those few who are now in the dock. What is at issue is where China goes now, nationally and internationally? Are there still illusions that when one has a “Nuclear” the backwardness of the enemy, including the military, doesn’t matter half as much as who becomes the ally, be it back with Russia or with the U.S.? The truth is that it’s not what is being decided at the trial that is decisive. The truth is that the only way to change direction, be it Maoist or Dengist, is to listen to the voices of revolt. China has a history of peasant revolt that is second to none, and it has a history of protestant and youth revolts that have not stopped, either with Mao’s last hurray or Deng’s removal of the Democracy Wall. It is they who have not yet said their last word.

Jan. 12, 1981

What is philosophy? What is revolution?

by Raya Dunayevskaya
Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION and Marxism and Freedom

Editor's Note: Below we print excerpts from a Political-Philosophical Letter written by Raya Dunayevskaya shortly after the seizure of the American Embassy in Iran, when much of the Left called the act an "anti-imperialist" one. The drive for political power on the basis of religion or on other narrow sectarian grounds, and not on the basis of a philosophy of revolution, is what Hegel described. The full text is included in the Political-Philosophical Letters of Raya Dunayevskaya, Vol. II, which contains as well, "The Cartesian/Descartes-Ordered Imperialist Intrusion Into Iran—and What About Khomeini's/Saddam's 'Holy War Against the Left'?"; "Grave Contradiction in Iranian Revolution?": From: Unfoldment of, and Contradictions in, Revolution?: "Special Introduction to Iranian Edition of Marx's 1844 Humanist Essays." The volume is available from News & Letters for $1.25.

It sounds so abstract, so easy to say, with Hegel, that philosophy is the "validating study of ideology" (para. 2). It surely sounds over-simplified to say, at one and the same time, that "Nature has given everyone a faculty of thought. But thought is all that philosophy claims as the form proper to her process..." (para. 5).

When, however, you realize that this is the Introduction to Encyclopaedia of Philosophical Sciences; that it was written after the French Revolution, which made popular an actual "permanent revolution"—so revolution is ever its first act alone—you can begin, just begin, to grasp the meaning of Hegel's expression, "second negativity."

Furthermore, Hegel had not found articulation that was until after Phenomenology of Mind, until after the Science of Logic, until after he tried in summarizing all of his works, including the 2,500-year history of philosophy. Then, of course, you realize why, when Hegel is speaking of philosophy, it is not an abstraction, that even though he limits it to thought and not matter, he can conclude in that very same Introduction:

"This duality between idea and reality is a favorite device of the analytic understanding in particular. Yet strangely in contrast with this separalist tendency, its own drama, halftide though they are, appear to be understanding something true and real! it prides itself on the imperative weight which it takes especial pleasure in prescribing on the field of politics. As if the world had waited on it to learn how it ought to be, and on not" (para. 6).

In very nearly the last work of Marx—the 1818 Preface to the French edition of the Communist Manifesto—that permanent revolution gets spelled out on a still higher level—that is, internationally as well as nationally. It is there that it is concentrated as the relationship between technologically advanced and technologically backward countries—i.e., that backward Russia could have its revolution ahead of "West Europe"—provides: 1) the revolution is accomplished within the context of European revolution; and 2) the new forces, in this case the peasant commune, are never cut off from both internationalism and...revolution. The idea is the power because it is concrete, i.e., total. It is multi-dimensional and at no time is the individual made just to tail-end the State or "committee." Rather, let us never forget the principle: the individual is the social entity, and society must never again be counterposed to the individual..."
reason or justification and which substitutes an orientation (extremely arbitrary under present conditions) almost in the form of a “law” for the revolutionary struggle against war and the conditions which generated this war.

Trotsky's specific article from which I quote this was dated Paris, Oct. 14, 1918. That article was part of what was written by those Marxists who had not betrayed and who tried to reconstruct themselves internationally—but not on the basis of Lenin's revolutionary struggle for “turn the imperialist war into the war” but on Trotsky's “Struggle for Peace”. In his 1919 Inauguration in War and Revolution, The Fall of the Second International and the Preparation of the Third, Trotsky stressed the internationalism and repeated that: “The March revolution liquidated these differences.”

But that is not true. Theoretical differences are not “genuinely” but become, in fact, you are a revolutionary. Quite the contrary. Once the host of the battle dies, the deviations from Marxism first come to plague you.

The truth is that the theoretical difference appears in a most horrible form exactly when the next new, objective situation arises. You must then dig for new philosophical depth on the basis of the highest possible as well as possible point just reached. If, instead, you remain without a philosophical model, the supposedly “correct” political analysis becomes, in a unit counter-revolution, definitely no more than talk-utopian.

* * *

**Perhaps I Shouldn't** have added only what is philosophy, what is revolution, but also what is anti-imperialism? Calling oneself a “follower of the I mam” does not constitute a revolutionary act, no matter how many times one repeats that this is anti-imperialist. The kind of anti-imperialism which is seen as “hating the masses and hating the masses, the unemploying the unemployed” is greater and has the infusion. As the young black vote found out in April, Mao's Cultural Revolution which they at first hastily endorsed because they thought it meant the displacement of the bureaucracy: “The more things change, the more they remain the same.”

Lenin had to begin again against himself, not just from the workers but from revolutionaries who had not seen the concrete, whether that was a new revolutionary force in another country or his own. What he had learned from the Hegelian dialectic that made him so sharp against his own Bolshevik colleagues was that overthrow, first negativity, was not enough; that you must now see that counter-revolution can arise from within the revolution itself.

And this alone made it possible not to stay at the overthrow of Tsarism and bourgeois democracy calling itself “rational”, though headed by a so-called socialist, Kerensky, and even supported by genuine revolutionaries....

It becomes imperative, therefore, to take a second look at these stages: February to April; April to June; July-August fall counter-revolution; October. As soon as the overthrow of the Tsar occurs, and while this great, historic, spontaneous outburst achieved what no Party nor War nor other could achieve, and though it was unanticipated by Lenin, he by no means let apathy overran him. Quite the contrary, he had already grasped with the Hegelian dialectic he had already analyzed the new stage of imperialism not just overthrowing the fruits of revolution and he already began to work out what became State and Revolution, that is to say, have the perspective of not only overthrow the but the real uprizing, so that only when production and the state would be in the hands of the whole population: “a man, woman, and child” would he be a new society.

Once that became the basis for all the activities of the Party, there was no separating the revolution from the philosophy of revolution. But the masses wanted it to go still further, directly to the concept of power: they underestimated the forces still in power, and it was the beginning of all the counter-revolutionary moves that still persist in the previous phase of this movement off an revolution, accusing Lenin of breaking with the German way and saying that is why he called for the end of the war. The relevant point for us today is that outright counter-revolution was initiated by Kerensky so that one still had to defend Kerensky, the manner in which it was done has all the answers against tsarism. It was at that point that whether it was the creation of a revolutionary military committee, which permitted no transfer of guns to the front unless they approved it, or whether it was such slogans as “All power to the Soviets”, or whether it was “Land, Bread and Peace”, there was no way whatever to conclude that Party with any other.

Contrast this to what everyone from Trotsky to Qaddafi is saying to blur those new grave contradictions within Iran... Qaddafi and Khomeini and General Ike may think the Middle East as they define it will be the graveyard of U.S. imperialism. Nothing could be further from the truth... Qaddafi takes advantage of the fact that supposedly there is no government in Libya because there is no Parliament, and supposedly it's a collectivist society because it calls itself Jamahiriya, which means "a command of the people." Is it they who decide everything? No, even the word, outcome, unless it's revolutionary—and unless the word revolution means total uprooting—is not the equivalent of desiring being in the hands of the people that is to say, with control of production in the hands of the workers. And so must the state be in their hands.

What now regressive stage are we in now, when religion versus also political power? First it was the Little Red Book of Mao. And now it's the Little Green Book of Qaddafi. And what part of the Koran will Khomeini employ in some brief saying that all must repeat?

It is not a question that a leader must write fifty books, like Marx or Lenin. It is a question of being serious about revolution and therefore the philosophy of revolution, and being responsible to History, which means men and women shaping history. You cannot throw out philosophy, and indulge in disengagement. Even a good bourgeois philosopher, at least in the stage when the bourgeoisie acquired its revolution, a good Lutheran like Hegel, who insisted all his life on the Church, had to submit to the dialectic drive of philosophy and subordinate religion to it. All his contradictions notwithstanding—and "revealed religion" is pretty high in the sphere of the Absolute, nothing can change the fact that it isn't the highest; that philosophy is. Needless to say, that revolution in thought initiated by Hegelian dialectic was transformed by Marx's new continent of thought into reality. Ever since then no revolution was successful that wasn't grounded in a philosophy of revolution.

—December 17, 1979
THEORY / PRACTICE

Preface to Iranian edition of Marx’s 1844 Essays

by Raya Dunayevskaya

Author of PHILOSOPHY AND REVOLUTION and Marxism and Freedom

The following special introduction for an Iranian edition of Marx’s Humanist Essays was written by Raya Dunayevskaya at the request of young Iranian revolutionaries who are involved in the battle against a counter-revolution that not only threatens from outside Iran, but that arises so quickly from within the revolution itself. We felt that this month was an historically appropriate time to share it with our readers, while Raya Dunayevskaya is on national lecture tour, because this May issue of NL commemoerates both May 1 as an international revolutionary celebration and May 5—Marx’s birthday—as a true birthstone of history—Charles Denby

Because there is nothing more exciting than addressing revolutionaries in an ongoing revolution, I feel very honored to have this opportunity. In 1960, I introduced Marx’s 1844 Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts, which opened an entirely new continent of thought and revolution that Marx named “a new Humanism.” The year that I was first able to publish those Humanist Essays as an Appendix to my work, Marxism and Freedom, a quarter of a century ago, coincided with the Hungarian Revolution against Russian totalitarianism calling itself Communism. Then, both from below, from an actual proletarian revolution, and from above, a today’s was shed upon those Essays that had lain on the dusty shelves and had never been practiced.

What is the contemporary world needs most today is a unity of Marx’s philosophy of liberation with an outright revolution, we must re-examine what is that Marx had meant when, in his greatest theoretical work, Capital, he had declared “human power is its own end” and what, in his very first historical materialist analysis in 1844, he had meant by saying “communism, as such, is not the goal of human development, the form of human society”—what the goal is, is the creation of human society, from the nature of history.

WHEN YOU TURN TO the Essays on “Private Property and Communism” and the “Critique of the Gotha Program,” you will note three things at once. First and foremost is the analysis of labor—and the very thing which distinguishes Marx from all other Socialists and Communists of his day and ours—goes much further than the economic structure of society. This analysis goes to the actual human relations. Secondly, it was not only Hegel whom Marx stood on his feet, unlike, instead of separating, thinking from being, it was also the “quite vulgar and unthinking communism that completely respects the personality of man.” Thirdly, and above all, is Marx’s concept of labor—that it is the creativity of the labor as the ground of all human society which uprises all of the old...

Whether capitalism achieves the domination of labor through ownership of or through control over the means of production, what Marx focuses on is that any “domination over the labor of others” proves not only capitalism’s exploitative but pernicious nature. To further stress the pernicious nature, Marx says that the whole of capitalism could be summed up in a single sentence: “Dead labor dominates living labor.” This class relationship transforms the living laborer into an appendage to the machine. Here is how Marx expresses it in the Humanist Essays.

Private property has made us so stupid and convinced that...in place of all the physical and spiritual sense there is a sense of possession which is the simple alienation of all these senses...The transcendence of private property is, therefore, the total freeing of all human senses and attributes. It is here, to make sure that one thereby does not jump to the conclusion that the abolition of private property creates a new society, that Marx rejected the very attempt to solve this problem of capital accumulation—his rejection of “vulgar and unthinking communism” focused instead on two other problems: 1) truly new human relations, the “humanist” in place of communism and 2) the totality of the widening of all old relations so that the dual rhythm of social revolution—the abolition of the old and the creation of the new—would run their full course.

IN ORDER TO FULLY grasp Marx’s Historical Materialism, the foundation for which was laid by these Humanist Essays, let us turn to the history of Marx’s day as well as of today. What we see, first and foremost, is that Marx, in laying the foundation of Historical Materialism, was also creating the theory of a proletarian revolution. The dialectic of Humanism, Marx’s greatest discovery — his concept of labor which revealed the laborer to be not just a form of revolution, but its bearer—meant that the proletariat was the “subject,” the Universal Subject how that was not just a result of history, but its shape, negating, i.e., abolishing, the exploitative reality. The exploited proletariat is the transformer of reality, to be sure, but Marx’s transcendence of the core of Hegel’s dialectic, naming “the dialectic of negativity as the new and creating principle.” In actually combining Marx, there lies hidden in Hegel’s Phenomenology of Mind “the movement of history.” The mystical will of men, Marx transformed the revolution in philosophy into a philosophy of revolution. Which is why Marx held that “Humanism distinguishes itself from idealism and Materialism, and it, at the same time, the truth uniting both...and capable of grasping the act of world history.”
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"Grasping the set of world history" meant that he had to proclaim "revolution in permanence," when he saw that no sooner had the masses helped the bourgeoisie gain victory over feudalism in the 1848 revolution than the bourgeoisie turned against them. And when he witnessed the greatest revolution in his time, the 1871 Paris Commune, and saw the masses take destiny into their own hands, Marx declared that revolte to be the "political form at last discovered to work out the economic emancipation of the proletariat." As Marx expressed it:

"We should especially avoid re-establishing society as an abstraction, opposed to the individual. The individual is the social entity."

MARK RAISED THE QUESTION of "revolution in permanence" not only for his day but as the way out for all unfinished revolutions. No age can understand that better than our own, plagued both by transformations into opposite after each revolution—such as that which saw the first workers' state that arose from the Russian Revolution turn into the state-capitalist nonentity that Russia is now—and by the shifting of today's revolutions before they came to completion.

The question is: What happens after the first act of revolution? Does a power of power assure a classless society or only a new class bureaucracy? Our age, which has witnessed a whole new Third World emerge from the struggle against Western imperialism (U.S. imperialism most of all) in Latin America as in Africa, in the Middle East as in Asia, needs to demand that "grasping the set of world history" means spelling out total freedom.

Here again, Marx can illuminate our task in the manner in which he spelled out how total must be the uprooting of the old and the creation of the new. He turned to the most fundamental of all human relationships—that of man to woman. In it we see why Marx opposed both private property and "vulgar communism":

The absolute contradiction in which man exists for himself is expressed in this relation to the woman as the source and handmaid of lust. For the secret of the relationship of man to man finds its unambiguous, definitive, open, obvious expression in the relationship of man to woman, and in this way, the direct, natural, necessary relationship of man to man is the relationship of man to woman.

Clearly, "each of the human relations to the world—seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, feeling, thought, perception—experience, willful activity, being" must transcend mere equality, a needed first achievement but not yet the needed total reorganization of human relations. Abolition of the old is only the first mediation. "Only by the transcendence of this mediation does there arise positive humanism, beginning from here.

* * *

AS ONE FOLLOWS Marx's view of total freedom, one can see how far beyond technology Marx's philosophy of revolution extended. Long before the atom was split and out of it came, not the greatest productive force, but the most destructive A-bomb, B-bomb and H-bomb, Marx wrote in these Essays: "To have one basis for life and another for science is a &quot;real&quot; man." With Hiroshima, we saw what a holocaust the lie of separating the reason for being from the reason for scientific development can become. Now, with the eruption of the world-wide anti-nuclear movement, we see all over again how urgent it is to study and practice Marx's new continuum of thought. As the great English poet William Blake expressed it, "nothing is more misleading than 'mindless entertainments'." Let us finish with those maxim's once and for all.

It is with the stirring for such a manifesto of total freedom that I, as Merrill Mattiazi, express my solidarity with the French revolutionaries as we all aspire to a new internationalism. The struggle continues.

November 1, 1980, Detroit, Michigan.